DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 530 24 VT 007 774

By-Gurin, Gerald
Inner-City Negro Youth in a Job Training Project: A Study of Factors Related to Attrition and Job Success. Final Report.
Michigan Univ., Ann Arbor. Survey Research Center.
Spons Agency-Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
Bureau No-BR 5-0075
Pub Date Dec 68
Contract-82-21-14 OEC-5-10-243
Note-155p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$7.85
Descriptors-*Adult Vocational Education, Basic Skills, Evaluation, Experimental Programs, Functional Illiteracy, *Individual Characteristics, Motivation, *Negro Youth, Out of School Youth, Student Attitudes, *Success Factors, Underemployed, Unemployed, Urban Dropouts, Vocational Followup
Identifiers-Chicago, Manpower Development and Training Act Programs, MDTA Programs, *Project Jobs

Results of a study of an experimental and demonstration job training project (Chicago JOBS Project) for approximately 1,500 underemployed "functionally illiterate" inner-city Negro youth are reported. The project, which lasted from September of 1963 to the summer of 1964, included basic education, vocational training, and group and personal counseling. The study focused on individual rather than program factors related to success, using data derived from questionnaires and interviews with 339 trainees, their mothers, job supervisors, and project staff. A secondary focus of the study was more on the training program itself and reactions of the trainees to the different aspects of the program. Trainees were interviewed upon entering the project, at its completion, and again six to nine months after leaving it. Among the conclusions were: (1) Skill training is clearly the most significant aspect of these manpower programs, even when heavy emphasis is placed on other things, (2) Basic education components of these programs must focus around content that is clearly and obviously job-related, (3) The counselor's personal interest, sympathy, and supportive functions may be more important than the more formal socializing functions, and (4) While the post-training employment of program completers was more regular than that of dropouts, there were no significant wage differences. (ET)

BR 5-0015
PA-24
OE-BR

INNER-CITY NEGRO YOUTH IN A JOB TRAINING PROJECT:

A Study of Factors Related to Attrition and Job Success

by

Gerald Gurin

A Final Report to the
Manpower Administration
U.S. Department of Labor

and the

Office of Education
U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare

SURVEY RESEARCH CENTER

VT003774

ISR Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Final Report to

U.S. Department of Labor
Manpower Administration

Contract No. 82-21-14

and

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Office of Education

Project No. 2798
Contract No. OE 5-10-243

INNER-CITY NEGRO YOUTH IN A JOB TRAINING PROJECT:
A Study of Factors Related to Attrition and Job Success

Gerald Gurin

Survey Research Center
Institute for Social Research
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

December 1968

This report on a special manpower project was prepared under a contract with the Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation and Research, U. S. Department of Labor, under the authority of the Manpower Development and Training Act, and a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Organizations undertaking such projects under the Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgment freely. Therefore, points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the Department of Labor or the Office of Education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES . . . v

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . ix

I. INTRODUCTION . . . 1

- Design of the Research . . . 2
- Outline of This Report . . . 4

II. TRAINEES' REACTIONS TO THE PROJECT . . . 5

- Skill Training in JOBS-I . . . 5
- Counseling in JOBS-I . . . 8
- Job-Relevance A Crucial Determinant of Trainees' Reactions . . . 8
- Reactions to Different Aspects of the Project . . . 12
- Reactions to the Project Staff . . . 14
- Some Further Questions on Reactions to the Project Staff . . . 18
- Significance of Race of Staff . . . 26
- Significance of Sex of Staff . . . 32
- Summary . . . 35

III. TWO CRITERIA OF SUCCESS . . . 37

- Post-Program Earnings . . . 38
  - The Measure of Earnings . . . 38
  - Post-Program Job History . . . 39
  - Comparison of Trainee and Supervisor Reports . . . 43
  - Relative Importance of Wage Rate and Regularity of Employment . . . 46
  - Job-Seeking Behavior . . . 49
- Dropout, Graduation and Placement as Criteria of Success . . . 51
  - Relationship to the Earnings Criterion . . . 51
  - Relative Importance of Wage Rate and Regularity of Employment . . . 53
- Other Success Indices . . . 57
  - Trainees' Interest in Further Training and Education . . . 57
  - Evaluations by Project Staff . . . 59
  - Evaluations by Job Supervisors . . . 61
  - Supervisors' Reactions to JOBS Project . . . 69
- Summary . . . 72

Page

IV. FACTORS RELATED TO SUCCESS: SOCIAL AND BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS . . 74

Age and Family Responsibilities 74
Pre-Program Job History 80
Educational Background and Achievement 81
Social Environment and Family Background 89

Summary 96

V. FACTORS RELATED TO SUCCESS: ATTITUDES AND MOTIVATIONS 98

The Means-Ends Issue 100

The Study Findings 103
Implications 113
The Implications of the Literature on Expectancy 118

The Issue of Internal-External Control 123

Summary 129

VI. SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS 132

Skill Training, Basic Education, and Counseling. 133

Skill Training. 133
Basic Education 133
Counseling. 134
Selection for the Different Staff Roles 135

Factors Related to Trainee Success 136

Dropout-Graduation as a "Success" Criterion 136
Factors Related to Post-Program Earnings. 137
Sex Differences 139

Concluding Comments. 139

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 141

APPENDIX A: Securing an Adequate Response Rate in the Post-Training Interview. 144

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1 Relation of Amount of Skill Training to Trainees' Feelings That Program Training was Relevant to First Post-Program Job (Post-Program Trainee Interview) 7

2 Increase in Pressure to Leave Program for a Job Between Entrance and Mid-Program Questionnaires (OJT Trainees Only) 10

3 Relation of Amount of Skill Training to Pressure to Leave Program for a Job (Mid-Program Questionnaire) 11

4 Relation of Amount of Skill Training (OJT or Vocational Education) to Trainees' Reactions to Different Aspects of Project 13

5 Relation of Amount of Skill Training (OJT or Vocational Education) to Trainees' Feeling that JOBS Project Made a Difference in Their Lives 15

6 Relation of Amount of Skill Training (OJT or Vocational Education) to Trainees' Feelings About Which Staff Member was Most Important and Helpful 16

7 Relation of Amount of Skill Training (OJT or Vocational Education) to Trainees' Contact With Staff After Leaving Program 16

8 Ways in Which Different Staff Were Considered Most Important and Helpful by Trainees 17

9 Relation of Position of Staff to Trainees' Reactions to Staff: For Male Trainees, Separately for Negro Male and White Male Staff . 21

10 Relation of Position of Staff to Trainees' Reactions to Staff: For Female Trainees, Separately for Negro Male and Negro Female Staff . 23

11 Relation of Staff Position to Staff Attitudes and Values: Male Staff 25

12 Relation of Race of Staff to Trainees' Reactions to Staff: Male Trainees 28

13 Correlations Between Trainees' Attraction to Staff Member and Perception that Staff Member Stresses "Middle-Class" Behaviors: For Male Trainees, Separately for Negro and White Staff 29

14 Relation of Race of Staff to Staff Attitudes and Values: Male Staff 31

15 Relationship of Sex of Staff to Trainees' Reactions to Staff: Female Trainees 33

Table Page

16 Correlations Between Trainees' Attraction to Staff Member and Perception that Staff Member Stresses "Middle-Class" Behaviors: For Female Trainees, Separately for Male and Female Staff 35

17 Post-Program Job History of Male and Female Trainees 41

18 Comparison of Beginning Pay on First and Second Post-Program Jobs of Trainees Who Had at Least Two Jobs After Leaving Program 42

19 Average Weekly Earnings in Six-Month Period Following End of JOBS Project: For Male and Female Trainees 43

20 Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Comparisons of Supervisors' and Trainees' Reports on Trainees' First Post-Program Jobs 45

21 Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Trainees' Reports of Post-Program Job History 47-48

22 Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Post-Program Job Seeking . . . 50

23 Relationship Between Dropout-Placement and Post-Program Earnings . . 52

24 Relation of Dropout-Placement to Trainees' Reports of Post-Program Job History 54-55

25 Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Post-Program Schooling 58

26 Relation of Dropout-Placement to Post-Program Schooling 58

27 Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Evaluations of Trainees by Program Staff 60

28 Relation of Dropout-Placement to Evaluations of Trainees by Program Staff 60

29 Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Evaluations of Trainees by Supervisors of First Post-Program Job 63-64

30 Relation of Dropout-Placement to Evaluations of Trainees by Supervisors of First Post-Program Job 66-67

31 Relation of Trainees' Post-Program Earnings to First-Job Supervisors' Reactions to JOBS Project 70

32 Relation of Dropout-Placement to First-Job Supervisors' Reactions to JOBS Project 71

33 Relation of Dropout-Placement to Age 75

34 Relation of Dropout-Placement to Family Responsibilities of Trainees 76

35 Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Age 77

Table | Page

36 Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Family Responsibilities of Trainees 79

37 Relation of Dropout-Placement to Pre-Program Job History 82

38 Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Pre-Program Job History 82

39 Relation of Dropout-Placement to Education 83

40 Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Education 84

41 Relation of Dropout-Placement to Educational Achievement Tests . . . 86

42 Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Educational Achievement Tests . 87

43 Relation of Dropout-Placement and Post-Program Earnings to Beta Intelligence Test Scores 90

44 Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Working Patterns in Social Environment 91

45 Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Matriarchal-Patriarchal Family Structure 93

46 Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Parents as Identification Figures 95

47 Relation of Dropout-Placement to Trainees' "Middle-Class" Attitudes 108

48 Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Trainees' "Middle-Class" Attitudes 109

49 Correlations Between Personal Efficacy During the Training Program and Post-Program Earnings: For Male Trainees 111

50 Correlations Between Post-Program Earnings and Personal Efficacy in the Post-Program Period: Partialing out the Effects of Personal Efficacy During the Program (For Male Trainees) 112

51 Relation of Dropout-Placement to Blame Attribution by Trainees . . . 125

52 Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Blame Attribution by Trainees . 128

Acknowledgements

This study has been conducted in association with Dr. John R. P. French Jr. of the Research Center for Group Dynamics of the Institute for Social Research, and Dr. David L. Bradford who is now at the University of Wisconsin. The study design, the interviews, the ideas and data analyses presented in this report are all a product of our joint efforts.

Among the many people at the Institute for Social Research who helped in this study, we wish particularly to thank the following: Dr. Nathan Caplan and Dennis Deshaies who were particularly important in our early study planning, whose insights and knowledge helped us structure the research, and who supervised the first three interview administrations; Mrs. Janice Marquis who was involved in many aspects of the study and whose ingenuity and dedication in supervising the final post-program interview administration is particularly appreciated; Misses Jeanne and Joanne Di Loreto who carried through the data analyses with great competence and good cheer; to Miss Margaret Robison who served as secretary of the project and typed endless interviews, questionnaires, codes and manuscripts in this longitudinal study.

Great appreciation is also due Mr. Judah Drob and Charles Phillips of the Labor Department for encouraging our attempts to broaden our data analyses and report beyond the usual program evaluation effort, and for their insightful comments and suggestions.

Finally, we would like to thank the people in the JOBS-I project: the staff who suffered our research demands with patience and understanding and openly shared their questions and doubts as well as their successes with us; and the trainees for their cheerful cooperation with what must have seemed our interminable intrusions.

CHAPTER I

Introduction

This is a report of a study of the backgrounds and motivations of the trainees that went through the first year of the Chicago JOBS Project in 1963-1964 and the relationship between these factors and trainee "success." The JOBS-I Project was one of the experimental and demonstration projects, set up under the Manpower Development and Training Act, devoted specifically to "hard core" unskilled inner-city youth. (JOBS refers to "Job Opportunities Through Better Skills"; it is not to be confused with the recently instituted JOBS program, "Job Opportunities in the Business Sector," which approaches the problem of hard-core unemployment in a large-scale national cooperative effort between business and the federal government.) Almost all the trainees in the JOBS-I Project were Negro,[1] most of them falling within the age range between 18 and 22. The great majority had had no regular employment lasting more than a few months. Most were school dropouts, the average performance on academic achievement tests falling below the sixth grade level.

The JOBS-I Project began in September of 1963 and continued officially until September of 1964, although most job placements had been made by June and July. Training in the JOBS Project was conducted at six centers or "units." All six units provided classes in basic education as well as daily discussion groups oriented toward issues of motivation and other problems trainees face. These counseling discussion groups placed particular emphasis on attempts to teach trainees the attitudes and behaviors appropriate in the world of work. In addition, three of the units provided training in a specific skill area whereas on-the-job training was provided the trainees in the other three units.

This research study is not an "evaluation" in the usual sense. The JOBS Project has continued in operation since the first year that we studied, training a number of different groups of trainees. It has changed in many very basic ways, some of which will be noted later, from the project that was conducted at the time this study was made. It would not be very meaningful to give the project a "grade" at this time about how "well" or "poorly" it did several years ago.

Even without this passage of time, the most meaningful purpose of research of this sort is not to commend or criticize a given project. Our interest in this study has been to utilize the experiences of the trainees in JOBS-I for the broad and general insights they give us about the problems that this population of trainees presents for such programs and the possible implications of these problems for program planning.

Although the JOBS Project itself and E and D programs in general have changed dramatically in the past few years, the characteristics and problems of the inner-city youth they deal with have unfortunately remained fairly constant. The time lag in our data is, therefore, least critical in what is the major focus of this report, namely, the study of the characteristics, motivations and attitudes of the trainees. The major purpose of the report is to examine the relationships between trainee characteristics and attitudes and their greater or lesser "success"; and, given these relationships between trainee characteristics and success, to at least note some possible implications for program planning. Two criteria of "success" will be utilized, those which have been traditionally of concern to people involved in these projects: (1) whether the trainees drop out or remain in the project, and (2) their success in the job world, as measured by their total earnings in the period following the end of the program.

---

[1] Since less than two percent of the trainees in the project were white, they were eliminated from the sample included in this study. For a more detailed description of the background characteristics of the trainees, see Chapter IV.

A secondary focus of this report will be on the characteristics of the training program and the trainees' responses to the different aspects of the program. As we have already indicated, we will not be concerned with how "well" the project as a whole accomplished its purposes. Our focus will be on how the trainees responded to different aspects of the program. The first year of the JOBS Project consisted of a number of activities - job training, basic education, group and personal counseling. The responses of the trainees to these different aspects of the program can give us some idea of the meaningfulness of such program activities to this type of population, over and above the issue of what the total complex of these activities accomplished in that particular program at that particular time.

We cannot, of course, completely divorce the trainees' reactions to a given program activity from the particular context within which it occurred. For example, the data we will present on the trainees' reactions to basic education classes refer to reactions to these classes as they were taught in JOBS-I. We will have to be cautious, therefore, in generalizing about the extent to which such classes fit in with the attitudes and motives of this type of population. The generalizations we attempt in our comments on the trainees' reactions to the different aspects of the program will have to be taken as suggestive rather than definitive. Indeed, this is a comment to be carefully borne in mind in evaluating all of the findings and tentative conclusions discussed in this report. What is represented here is a very rough exploratory beginning attempt at research in the complex problems involved in this area.

Design of the Research

The major data of the research discussed in this report come from a series of questionnaires and interviews given to the trainees in the project. The study is longitudinal in nature; that is, it studies the same trainees at several points in time - when they entered the program, during the program, at the time of its completion and six months to a year after its termination.

About 700 trainees entered the JOBS Project in September of 1963 and an additional 350 in January of 1964.[2] The first group of 700 included trainees at all six units, whereas the second group of 350 included only trainees in the three OJT units. Since our work on the research study did not begin until November of 1963, we handled these two groups of trainees separately in our study design. On the group entering in January, we obtained questionnaire and interview data at the time they entered the program, again at the time the project effectively ended in June and July of 1964, and finally in the post-training period between February and May of 1965. Thus, for the January entrants, we are able to relate later success and failure to the attitudes and motives they expressed before they entered the training program. On the group that had already begun the program in September of 1963, we focused on the last few months of the project since our observations led us to believe that this period of preparation and transition from the relative security of the project to the anxiety of the work world is a crucial one of particular importance to study. We, therefore, obtained our first interview and questionnaire data on this group in March and April of 1964, with our second measures at the terminal point of the project in June and July, and our third measures again in the post-training period in February to May of 1965.

---

[2] These figures refer to the numbers of trainees entering the program at the two beginning periods. There was a high level of turnover in the project and a total of over 1,500 trainees were involved in the project at some time.

Questionnaires were given to all trainees entering in January and to all trainees at the six different units during the March-April and June-July periods. Because of the trainees' literacy problems, in most cases the questionnaires were administered in small groups by our interviewer staff who read the questionnaires with the trainees. In addition to these questionnaires, intensive personal interviews were held with samples of trainees: 88[3] in the January group and 133[4] in the March-April period, with 159 of these being reinterviewed in the June-July period.[5] These interviews covered a wide range of variables including motivational data, work attitudes, reactions to the JOBS Project, job history and expectations, demographic, family and background characteristics, and lasted anywhere from one and one-half to four hours in duration.

In the post-training period we had originally intended to interview only trainees who had already been interviewed. Due to the large dropout rate from the program, this would have meant that only about one-fourth of our post-training interviews would have included trainees who stayed with the program to the point of being placed on a job by the JOBS Project (although many of the others had left the program and obtained jobs on their own). Since a major purpose of the post-training interviews was to enable us to analyze the differences between "successful" and "unsuccessful" trainees, we decided to add to our post-training interview sample all trainees who completed the project and were placed on a job by the project staff by September of 1964, and on whom we had some previous questionnaire (although no interview) data. This added over 100 trainees to our final interview sample. A total of 339 trainees were interviewed in this final period.

---

[3] As previously noted, trainees entering the JOBS Project in January of 1964 were included only in the three on-the-job training units. In choosing the interview sample a random sample of 30 trainees was drawn from each of the three units with 88 of these 90 being contacted and interviewed.

[4] In drawing a sample of the September 1963 entrants who were first interviewed in March-April of 1964, a random sample of 15 trainees was drawn from each of the three on-the-job units and 30 trainees from each of the three other units, with 133 of these 135 being contacted and interviewed.

[5] In the June-July interviews we experienced considerable difficulty in contacting the trainees we had originally interviewed in those cases where trainees had already left the project. In learning from this experience we were much more successful in the post-training interviews. This latter experience is discussed in Appendix A.

In addition to these questionnaires and interviews on the trainees, personal interviews were conducted during the training program with the heads and employment directors of the six units and with a sample of the counselors and teachers. In addition, questionnaires were given to all staff members. In the post-training period, in addition to the trainee interviews, interviews were also obtained with the supervisors of the first job each trainee in our interview sample went to after the training program, and with the mother of each of these trainees. The purpose of the supervisor interviews was to assess the success of the project as viewed by the people in some ways most highly qualified to judge the effectiveness of the trainees in an actual job situation. The purpose of the interviews with the mothers was to study some of the background family factors whose importance, although always recognized, has become highlighted recently in the discussion around the "Moynihan Report."

It will be noted that the major population of the study consists of the youths who were trainees in this project, and there is no control group of comparable individuals who did not undergo the project experience. This lack of a control group is less critical than it would have been if the purpose of the study had been to arrive at an evaluation of the project as a whole. Since this was not the purpose of the research, we were not concerned with the question of how well people who experienced the program did on some success criterion in comparison with a control group of comparable individuals who did not undergo the program experience. Rather, as we have already indicated, our concern is to differentiate the trainees we are studying on some success criteria and to address ourselves to the question of why some trainees emerge as more successful than others - what are the individual, background and attitudinal characteristics related to greater or lesser success.

A final comment might be made on the funding of this research. This study has been conducted under the joint sponsorship of the Departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare. Because of the limitation of available funds, the contract with the Labor Department provided only for the gathering of the data on the trainees and project personnel up to the date of the termination of the project. The interviews with the supervisors, parents and trainees in the post-training period as well as the analyses of these data, have been supported by a grant from the Office of Education.

Outline of This Report

The remainder of this report will be conerned with the discussion of the findings from the research. Chapter II will discuss the characteristics of the program particularly salient to the research and the trainees' reactions to these different program characteristics. Chapter III will discuss the two criteria of success, dropout and total earnings, their interrelationships and other characteristics of these criteria. Chapters IV and V will then discuss factors related to these two success criteria, Chapter IV focusing on background and family factors and Chapter V on trainees' attitudes and motives. Chapter VI will then present a summary of the major findings and a discussion of their possible implications for programs devoted to these populations and problems.

CHAPTER II

Trainees' Reactions to the Project

A detailed description of the JOBS-I Project is presented in the final report of that project, prepared by the project staff for the Department of Labor.[1] In this chapter we would like to discuss only a few of the characteristics of this project - those which have most general relevance and implications, as well as those characteristics which are important as a backdrop for understanding some of the findings of the study that will be discussed in the chapters that follow.

As we have indicated, the most important feature of the JOBS-I Project was its three-faceted nature - its stress on basic education and counseling as well as on job skill training. This multi-faceted approach is outlined in the first paragraph of the final report of the project to which we have already referred.

> The JOBS Project was designed to train 1,000 currently unemployable youths (many functionally illiterate), to reach the necessary educational level for employment, to develop the attitudes required for employment, to acquire some job skill experience and, finally, to be placed in employment.

A major concern in this chapter, therefore, will be to present findings indicating how the trainees reacted to the different aspects of the program, which ones they felt were most and least useful, and the reasons for their feelings. Before looking at these findings, however, it is important to describe the ways in which skill training and counseling developed in the course of the JOBS-I Project. There were special issues and problems involved in these two facets of the program that should be kept in mind in evaluating the trainees' reactions to them.

Skill Training in JOBS-I

With respect to skill training, the JOBS-I Project had some limitations that often appeared in this type of project several years ago. In their great concern over some of the other problems presented by the trainees - the literacy and attitudinal and motivational problems - people setting up these projects sometimes tended to underplay the basic issues of skill training and placement in a job utilizing this training.

This was somewhat true in the JOBS-I Project, particularly in the on-the-job training part of the program. As we noted in the preceding chapter, there were two different wings of the project - one providing on-the-job training in industries, the other providing vocational training at the units. As is discussed in some detail in the final report of the project, the on-the-job training wing of the program experienced great difficulties and very few trainees received any meaningful industrial placements. Essentially, then, for most of the trainees in the on-the-job training wing of the project, the program training consisted of only basic education and counseling sessions, with actual job skill training minimal or nonexistent.

---

[1] Job Opportunities Through Better Skills, '63-'64 Final Report. OMAT Project Number 82-12-16.

The situation in the vocational education wing of the project was better in this respect. Training occurred at three units: one devoted to the teaching of mail preparing and handling and duplicating machine operations; a second to automotive service station skills; and a third to the training of clerk-typists. Here the issue was not that the trainees received no skill training, but rather that this training was not always completed to the point where a trainee could obtain and hold a job that actually utilized the skills he had learned.

These factors, then, resulted in a program in which skill training was not as relevant as it might have been to the post-program experience of the trainees. The results of this are seen in Table 1 which presents the responses of the trainees to two questions in the final interview that are particularly relevent to our present discussion. These questions from the interview given a number of months after the trainees had left the program, asked the trainees about the relevance the project training had had to what they were required to do in the first job they went to after leaving the program. One question was directed specifically to the issue of skill training, asking the trainees whether the JOBS Project had trained them for "this kind of work." The other was phrased more generally, asking them whether any of their learning on the project "helped them do this job well."

Table 1 presents the responses to these two questions separately for the men and women trainees who had been in the two different wings of the project - OJT and vocational education. First, looking at the trainees who went through the OJT wing of the program (which represented essentially no skill training), we see that only a handful said that they felt the JOBS Project trained them for the kind of work they were doing on the first post-program job. A much larger proportion of trainees felt that some kind of learning on the JOBS Project helped them do this job well; however, when the trainees were further asked what kind of learning was helpful, only three percent of the men trainees from OJT and one percent of the women trainees said that it was the job and skill training they learned in the project that was helpful in the first post-program job.

When we look at the trainees who were enrolled in the vocational education wing of the program, we see that there are more trainees who felt that their skill training in the project was relevant to the post-program job, but here, too, we find that this is true for less than half of the trainees. When asked specifically whether the JOBS Project trained them for the kind of work they got after leaving the program, only 21 percent of the men trainees and 31 percent of the women trainees in the vocational education part of the program answered in the affirmative. Somewhat larger proportions mentioned job and skill training as helpful in some way on this first post-program job. Here the figures are 27 percent for the men and 52 percent for the women. (Skill training can be seen as helpful even if the job does not utilize the specific skills, since there is some transferability of skills.)

One further comment might be made on the findings depicted in Table 1. Although in general they indicate that even when the program included skill training it usually was not training that led to a relevant job in the post-program world, this is more true with respect to the men than the women trainees.

It will be noted in this table that women after leaving the program somewhat more often got jobs that utilized the training they had received. This was mainly a function of the fact that the type of clerical jobs that women were trained for in the project often led to a job at least somewhat relevant to these skills, than was true of the more mechanical, automotive jobs that made up a large part of the men's skill training.[2]

TABLE 1

Relation of Amount of Skill Training to Trainees' Feelings That Program Training was Relevant to First Post-Program Job (Post-Program Trainee Interview)

	Males		Females	
	No Skill Training (OJT) (N = 98)	Some Skill Training (Voc Ed) (N = 75)	No Skill Training (OJT) (N = 70)	Some Skill Training (Voc Ed) (N = 52)
Proportion of trainees who felt that the JOBS Project trained them for "this kind of work"	0%	21%	1%	31%
	p = .01*		p = .01*	
Proportion of trainees who felt that the following kinds of learning on the JOBS Project "helped them do this job well":				
Education: Arithmetic, reading, etc	9%	4%	11%	2%
Job and skill training	3	27	1	52
Attitudinal & behavioral learning	14	23	17	13
Other	2	1	4	0
Total who felt that their learning was helpful	28%	55%	33%	67%
	p = .01*		p = .01*	

*In this and the following tables, when proportions giving a particular response are compared, the test of the difference between proportions w[illegible]sed to estimate significance; when the total distributions are compared, chi-s[illegible] was used; when means are compared, the t-test was used. Given the exploratory nature of this research, p values in all instances refer to two-tail tests.

---

[2] It should be noted that in Table 1 we present figures on all trainees who were enrolled in the vocational education classes - those who dropped out before completing the training as well as those who remained until the end. We present the figures for the total group because in the remaining discussion in this chapter we will be dealing with the reactions to the program of all the trainees who were enrolled. If we consider only those people who remained in the project until the end and were placed on a job by the project, a larger proportion of trainees got jobs utilizing the training they received, although this is true only for the vocational education wing of the project.

This, then, was one major characteristic of the way the JOBS Project developed during its first year. The majority of the trainees either received no skill training at all or training that was not directly relevant to the job they actually received upon leaving the program. This fact will be crucial to keep in mind when we examine the trainees' reactions to different aspects of the program in the discussion below.

Counseling in JOBS-I

Some comments on the counselor's role in the JOBS-I Project should also be made before we turn to the data on the trainees' reactions to the different parts of the project. Counseling was a very major aspect of the JOBS-I Project, in some sense its most important innovative effort. Fifty counselors were involved in the project, one for every 20 trainees.

To a large extent the counselor role was viewed as experimental. No clear job specifications were set down at the beginning and the definitions of the counseling function tended to develop during the course of the project. Within this vagueness, however, two major functions developed. At an informal level the counselor functioned in a general personal supportive role; he was a person to whom the trainee could turn for personal help and comfort with problems that were bothering him. At a more formal level, each counselor conducted a group discussion session each day where the focus was not on the trainee's individual personal problems but rather on the "resocialization" needs of the total group. These sessions were oriented toward helping the trainees learn what the staff considered to be some of the attitudes and behaviors essential in the world of work.

These dual purposes - personal support and resocialization - are summarized in the final report of the project: "the counselors were to be subprofessionals, near in age to the trainees, who would relate to them at the personal level and conduct small group discussions with their particular group in hopes of effecting some attitudinal change." As subprofessionals their work in the personal area was conceived to be supportive in nature rather than therapeutic in any systematic sense. We will see some of the implications of this dual function of the counselor in the discussion of the data on the trainees' reactions to the counselors and the counseling sessions.

With these comments on some of the characteristics of the job skill training and counseling aspects of the JOBS-I Project, we may now turn to the data on the trainees' reactions to the project.

Job-Relevance A Crucial Determinant of Trainees' Reactions

The reactions to any program depend to a great extent on the expectations and desires that people bring to it. Despite the multifaceted aspects of the JOBS Project it is clear that trainees came to it with one overriding purpose: to learn a skill and to get a job. In the interview the trainees were given at the end of the project (June and July of 1964) they were asked what they had hoped to get out of the JOBS Project when they entered it. About 85 percent of the trainees answered that they came to learn a skill and to get a job. Very few mentioned either education or the attitudinal and behavioral learnings that were also a significant part of the JOBS Project.

This pressure for a job can build up during the course of a project and can represent one of the major problems a project faces in keeping the trainees involved and with the project over the course of months. This increasing pressure for a job is indicated in the data presented in Table 2. This table presents comparisons of the responses trainees gave when they first entered the program (in January of 1964) and at the midpoint of the project (in April of 1964) to a set of questions that asked them to contrast the appeal of staying in the program with the pull that would be exerted by an available job outside the program. These figures are presented only for the OJT trainees since it was only on these trainees that we were able to get entering data in January of 1964.[3]

In one question trainees were asked to respond to a series of statements describing their attitudes toward the program, among which was the statement "Instead of being in this program I wish I was out working." Looking at the men trainees we find in Table 2 that whereas 24 percent checked "I feel this way very much" about this statement when they entered the program, 59 percent felt this way after they had been in the program several months. The comparable figures for the women trainees are even more striking, the percentages going from 11 percent of the trainees upon entrance to 63 percent at the midpoint of the project.

A similar change is seen in Table 2 in the trainees' responses to a question which asked them to react to a series of statements depicting various conditions under which they might leave the program. Table 2 presents the proportions of trainees who checked "I would probably quit if this happened" in responding to the statement "If I could get a job." We see in this table that the proportion who felt that they would probably leave the program for a job increased from 19 percent to 36 percent among the men trainees and from 16 percent to 47 percent among the women trainees.

It is particularly important to underscore that this increased pressure toward a job does not seem to be a reflection of any increased economic pressure occurring as the program progresses. In the same question that asked the trainees whether they would probably quit if they could get a job, they were asked to check whether they would leave the program "If I couldn't manage on the money I got each week, if I couldn't make ends meet." We see in Table 2 that there was no difference in the trainees' responses to this question between the time they entered the program and the period a few months later when they answered the next questionnaires.

Thus, the increasing pressure to get a job that the OJT trainees experienced as the program progressed does not seem to be due to any increased sensitivity to their economic situation. Rather, the problem seems to have been a growing sense of purposelessness. As the program progressed, the trainee seems more and more to have questioned what all of this was leading to. His motivation and commitment to the program declined as he came to question whether the program training was really relevant to his later chances in the job world.

This latter interpretation of the findings is supported by the data in Table 3 where we compare the way OJT and vocational education trainees answered

---

[3] See discussion of the design of the study in the preceding chapter.

TABLE 2

Increase in Pressure to Leave Program for a Job Between Entrance and Mid-Program Questionnaires (OJT Trainees Only)

	Males		Females	
	Entrance (N = 138)	Mid-Program (N = 122)	Entrance (N = 120)	Mid-Program (N = 126)
Proportion of trainees who checked "I feel this way very much" to the following statement: "Instead of being in this program, I wish I was out working"	24%	59%	11%	63%
	p = .01		p = .01	
Proportion of trainees who checked "I would probably quit if this happened" to the following statement: "If I could get a job"	19%	36%	16%	47%
	p = .01		p = .01	
Proportion of trainees who checked "I would probably quit if this happened" to the following statement: "If I couldn't manage on the money I got each week. If I couldn't make ends meet"	14%	16%	10%	10%
	p = NS		p = NS	

the same set of questions, in the mid-program questionnaires which were given to trainees in all the units. If the reason for the increased appeal of getting an immediate job, even if it meant leaving the program, was a growing questioning of whether the program was really relevant to getting a job rather than any increase in economic pressure, then we would expect this feeling to be particularly apparent among the trainees in the OJT wing of the program. It will be recalled from our preceding discussion that the trainees in the OJT section of the program ended up essentially getting no skill training. Therefore, they should feel more sense of purposelessness about the program than do the trainees in the vocational education wing of the program and be much more ready to leave the program for a job.

We see in Table 3 that this is true. For both males and females, trainees who received no skill training much more often expressed the desire to be out working instead of in the program and also somewhat more often felt they would probably leave the program if they could get a job (although the latter relationship was not as large and significant). Again, this difference is not due to any difference in feelings of economic pressure; there was no difference between OJT and vocational education trainees in their feelings about whether or not they would leave the program if they could not manage economically. The differences among trainees in commitment and motivation to remain in the program seem to have been a reaction to the very simple and basic issue of whether the program was providing them job skill training and thus offering some promise of fulfilling the overriding purpose for which trainees entered the program.

TABLE 3

Relation of Amount of Skill Training to Pressure to Leave Program for a Job (Mid-Program Questionnaire)

	Males		Females	
	No Skill Training (OJT) (N = 122)	Some Skill Training (Voc Ed) (N = 168)	No Skill Training (OJT) (N = 126)	Some Skill Training (Voc Ed) (N = 95)
Proportion of trainees who checked "I feel this way very much" to the following statement: "Instead of being in this program, I wish I was out working"	59%	35%	63%	38%
	p = .01		p = .01	
Proportion of trainees who checked "I would probably quit if this happened" to the following statement: "If I could get a job"	36%	25%	47%	33%
	p = .05		p = .05	
Proportion of trainees who checked "I would probably quit if this happened" to the following statement: "If I couldn't manage on the money I got each week. If I couldn't make ends meet"	16%	20%	10%	11%
	p = NS		p = NS	

It might be noted at this point that the attitudinal differences between OJT and vocational education trainees that appear in Table 3 were reflected in certain behavioral indices as well. Particularly relevant is the difference in the attendance figures in the two wings of the program. In the final report of the project it was noted that whereas attendance in all units declined during the course of the project, the decline in the vocational education units was only half as great as the decline in the OJT units. In presenting these figures the final report pointed to the same issue we have stressed: "This represents a statistical underscoring of the JOBS staff's conviction that it is easier to hold and to build a trainee's enthusiasm when he is learning a specific vocation and when his basic education can be geared to that vocation."

It may seem obvious to stress the fact that motivation to remain in such a program will diminish when a person feels he is not receiving the training that will be relevant in the job world he will enter after leaving the project. But the focus on the other needs such trainees have - their attitudinal and behavioral problems, their literacy problem - has sometimes in the past operated to make one minimize this obvious point. The concern over the "special" pathological motivational problems of this population of youth can blind one to the fact that many of their motivational problems are fairly straightforward reactions to some obvious realities in their immediate situations.

These comments about the significance of job skill training should be kept in mind in the review of findings in the remainder of this chapter. We will see in our discussion below that despite the disappointment over the job skill training, many trainees did react positively to the program as a whole and did feel that the other aspects of the program were of value. In a sense, for many trainees the basic education and the counseling relationship and group sessions offered an unexpected bonus of the program. It will be important, therefore, when looking at these results, to remember that although they are of value and were positively received, they are not alternatives to the learning of a skill.

Reactions to Different Aspects of the Project

With some of these considerations in mind, we can now turn to the way the trainees reacted to the three major aspects of the project. In the interview given to the trainees in the post-program period, two questions were asked. Trainees were asked which part of the project they had found most helpful and which, if any, they had found "a waste of time." The trainees' responses to these two questions are presented in Table 4. The findings are presented separately for the trainees from vocational education and OJT units.

If we take as our model the situation in the project where skill training was both taught in the unit and ended up being most related to the jobs that trainees got in the post-program world, the most relevant group to look at is the women in the vocational education program, since it will be recalled that women in this program more than men ended up in jobs that utilized their skill training. In this group we clearly see that when people receive training in skills that are relevant in the post-program world, the importance of the vocational training aspect of the project is clearly highlighted. Sixty-four percent of the women in the vocational education wing of the program listed their skill training as the most helpful part of the project and only eight percent of the women indicated that it was a waste of time. This highlights our preceding comments about the overwhelming importance of skill training to the trainees in such a project. When trainees are taught skills that are later utilized, the skill training aspect of the project is something the trainees are both most positive and least negative about. In similar fashion, among the men in the vocational education part of the program, where as we noted previously their skill training was less relevant to their post-program employment, we find that the skill training is somewhat less often noted as the most helpful aspect of the project and more often criticized as a waste of time.

The comparison of the responses to the basic education and group counseling aspects of the project are also of interest in Table 4. In both the OJT and vocational education wings of the project we find that basic education is more often seen as a helpful part of the project but is also more often seen as a waste of time. In comparison to basic education, the counseling sessions seem less relevant and salient. They are less often praised but also less often criticized than is true of basic education classes. As we shall see later, this does not mean that the counselor or his individual relationship with the trainees was less important. What are probably represented in Table 4 are the trainees' reactions to the formal aspects of the counseling sessions, the one-hour-a-day group discussions. To some extent the fact that these sessions were less salient may reflect the differential time spent on them in contrast with the time spent in basic education. Several hours a day were spent on literacy training, only one hour a day on the formal group discussion sessions.

There has been much concern in these programs that the focus on basic literacy training might create problems for people who have usually had a rather unfortunate school experience. There was little indication in the questionnaire and interview responses that trainees had strong negative reactions to the basic education classes. There was little feeling expressed against "being back in school." And many, as indicated in Table 4, singled out the basic education classes as the most helpful part of the project.

TABLE 4

Relation of Amount of Skill Training (OJT or Vocational Education) to Trainees' Reactions to Different Aspects of Project

A. Parts of Project Viewed by Trainees as Most Helpful

	Males		Females	
	No Skill Training (OJT) (N = 108)	Some Skill Training (Voc Ed) (N = 77)	No Skill Training (OJT) (N = 90)	Some Skill Training (Voc Ed) (N = 61)
Basic education	73%	44%	71%	28%
Counseling, group discussions	15	4	20	8
Job and skill training	6	49	2	64
Other or none	6	3	7	-
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Chi^2 = 50.95, df = 3 p = .001		Chi^2 = 66.65, df = 3 p = .001	

B. Parts of Project Viewed by Trainees as a Waste of Time

	(N = 105)	(N = 76)	(N = 88)	(N = 60)
Basic education	24%	24%	28%	36%
Counseling, group discussions	12	11	15	15
Job and skill training	3	24	1	8
Other	24	6	18	11
None	37	35	38	30
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Chi^2 = 24.67, df = 4 p = .001		Chi^2 = 8.57, df = 4 p = .10	

The problem with respect to basic education classes seems to be not so much a question of antipathy toward school as an issue of the relevance of the education to the trainees' occupational concerns. The fact that over one-fourth of the trainees single this aspect of the program out as "a waste of time" - more than do so with respect to any other aspect of the program - suggests that for many trainees there is no clear connection between the education classes and the work they hope to get in the post-program world.

The fact that many trainees do not see education as relevant to the world of work is perhaps even clearer in the responses to other questions in the interview. Relevant to this issue are some of the findings we have already discussed in Table 1 above. In their responses to the question that asked them what type of learning from the JOBS Project was most helpful in their first post-program job, only a small proportion of the trainees mentioned their educational learning. A much larger proportion of trainees, it should be noted in Table 1, mentioned the attitudinal and behavioral learning that was the focus of the counseling sessions.

A similar set of findings occurs in the response to another question in the post-program interview. Trainees were asked whether they felt that being in the JOBS Project made any difference in their life and about three out of five trainees felt that it had. When they were further asked what the nature of the difference was, we again find, in Table 5, that only a few percent mentioned some of the educational skills they had learned. Again, the behavioral skills and some of the motivational issues that had been the focus of the counseling sessions emerged as more important considerations.

The counseling sessions apparently, although not singled out in general as more helpful than educational learning, appear to have been more often viewed by the trainees as relevant to their later life. This perhaps reflects the fact that the counseling sessions were very clearly oriented toward helping the trainees in the job world, toward inculcating the attitudes and behavior which it was felt would be relevant to their later jobs. The role-playing, the practice sessions on how one interviews for a job, the other topics to which these counseling sessions were devoted were always explicitly oriented toward the world beyond the classroom. This connection was not as clearly focused in the educational training.

The issue this presents for projects concerned with basic education is clear. The problem is to present the basic education in a context which makes clear its relevance to the job world. It is a "so what" attitude more than a negative attitude toward school with which one has to deal and which one has to overcome.

Reactions to the Project Staff

In their responses to the questions asking them which aspects of the program were most helpful and which were most a "waste of time," the formal counseling sessions emerged as the least salient aspect of the program. They were least often chosen as most helpful and least often criticized. Given that the group discussions were relatively undervalued, it is interesting to note the responses of the trainees to a question asking them who was the staff person on the project most important and helpful to them. In response to this question the trainees more often chose the counselor than either the basic education or the vocational education instructor, as the findings in Table 6 indicate. The greater importance of the counselor is further indicated in the fact that the trainee much more often maintained contact with him after the training program than was true

TABLE 5

Relation of Amount of Skill Training (OJT or Vocational Education) to Trainees' Feeling That JOBS Project Made a Difference in Their Lives

		Males			Females		
		No Skill Training (OJT) (N = 108)	Some Skill Training (Voc Ed) (N = 77)	Total (N = 185)	No Skill Training (OJT) (N = 88)	Some Skill Training (Voc Ed) (N = 62)	Total (N = 150)
Did being in the JOBS Project make any difference in your life?	Yes	60%	70%	64%	52%	63%	57%
	No	40	30	36	48	37	43
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		Chi^2 = 1.55, df = 1 p = NS			Chi^2 = 1.79, df = 1 p = NS		
What difference did it make?							
Education: taught me reading, writing, etc		8%	4%	7%	2%	0%	1%
Taught skills; got me a job		6	21	12	7	25	14
Taught behavioral skills: how to dress, act, relate to others		9	7	8	18	13	16
Affected motivations and attitudes: increased my self-confidence, made me try harder		26	26	26	19	18	19
Other		11	12	11	6	7	7
No difference		40	30	36	48	37	43
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		Chi^2 = 12.05, df = 5 p = .05			Chi^2 = 13.06, df = 5 p = .05		

with respect to the other staff members. In the post-program interview trainees were asked whether they had ever seen any of the staff members after leaving the program. As indicated in Table 7, a little over half the trainees indicated they had had some contact, and in more cases than was true with any other staff member, the person that they did have contact with was the counselor.

TABLE 6

Relation of Amount of Skill Training (OJT or Vocational Education) to Trainees' Feelings About Which Staff Member Was Most Important and Helpful

	Males		Females	
	No Skill Training (OJT) (N = 99)	Some Skill Training (Voc Ed) (N = 76)	No Skill Training (OJT) (N = 87)	Some Skill Training (Voc Ed) (N = 59)
Counselor	61%	37%	66%	46%
Basic education teacher	22	26	20	22
Vocational education teacher	1	28	-	25
Other or no one helpful	16	9	14	7
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Chi^2 = 28.80, df = 3 p = .001		Chi^2 = 27.24, df = 3 p = .001	

TABLE 7

Relation of Amount of Skill Training (OJT or Vocational Education) to Trainees' Contact With Staff After Leaving Program

	Males		Females	
	No Skill Training (OJT) (N = 103)	Some Skill Training (Voc Ed) (N = 75)	No Skill Training (OJT) (N = 89)	Some Skill Training (Voc Ed) (N = 62)
Had some contact with:				
Counselor	41%	25%	45%	27%
Basic education teacher	14	12	5	7
Vocational education teacher	1	19	-	7
Unit director, employment director, other	1	15	3	7
Had no contact	43	29	47	52
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Chi^2 = 35.79, df = 4 p = .001		Chi^2 = 7.90, df = 4 p = NS	

The reasons for choosing the counselor as most important and helpful are also of interest. Table 8 indicates the ways in which different staff people were considered by the trainees to be most important and helpful. After indicating who they felt was most helpful, the trainees were asked in what way the person was helpful. The responses were coded into the four categories indicated in Table 8, according to what the trainee stressed in his response. These four categories were: the content of the staff person's teaching, what the staff person taught them (that is, education or skill training in the case of the basic education or vocational education teacher, particular behavioral learning such as how to apply for a job or how to dress, in the case where the staff person was the counselor); the staff person's behavior as a teacher (for example, whether he was a good teacher, fair, whether he gave special teaching help to the trainee); the staff person's behavior as a person (for example, whether he was "straight," friendly, whether the trainee felt he could always talk to him); and whether the staff person helped the trainee with his problems (that is, the trainee's problems as a person as well as any particular problems he might have around jobs and the occupational world).

TABLE 8

Ways in Which Different Staff Were Considered Most Important and Helpful by Trainees

	Counselors (N = 170)	Basic Education Teachers (N = 72)	Vocational Education Teachers (N = 37)
Content of teaching	14%	30%	43%
Behavior as a teacher	16	36	49
Behavior as a person	26	12	5
Help with trainee's problems	44	22	3
	100%	100%	100%

$\text{Chi}^2 = 62.16$, df = 6
p = .001

We see in Table 8 that the predominant reaction of the trainees who chose the counselor as most important was to see him as important not in his teacher's role as a group discussion leader, not as a "socializer for the world of work," but important as a person and in his individual relationship with the trainee around the individual problems that the trainee brought to him. The counselor was important as someone the trainee could talk to, could take his problems to, in contrast to the other staff members whose importance was predominantly in their teaching roles.

Although theoretically much can be and has been said supporting the significance of group discussions and the tasks toward which the group discussions were directed, the types of problems that the trainees face require a good deal of individual support. Particularly with the subprofessional counselors that these programs utilize, it is likely that the supportive individual relationships that the counselors establish with the trainees may be more crucial and important to the trainees than their performance as group leaders or their roles as socializers.

Table 8 also indicates an interesting difference in the reactions of the trainees to the basic education and vocational education teachers. Although the basic education teachers were viewed predominantly as teachers, a considerable number of trainees also felt they were important because of the individual personal relationship established with the trainee. Thirty-six percent of the trainees who felt that the basic education teacher was the most helpful staff member singled out his behavior as a person or his help with the trainee's problems, in contrast to only eight percent who mentioned the vocational education teachers as most helpful for these reasons. The basic education teachers in programs such as this to some extent get involved in personal relationships beyond their teacher role. On this dimension they seem to have a middle position between the counselors whose relationship with the trainees is clearly personal and the vocational education teachers who relate to the trainees completely as teachers of skills.

This distinction is probably not so much a function of different requirements of the two different roles as of the types of people filling the roles. The people filling the vocational education roles come predominantly from vocational rather than educational backgrounds and are less oriented toward the interpersonal aspects of their relationship with the people they are teaching. This kind of issue is an important one to recognize, particularly in the light of some suggestions that are currently being made about projects such as these. Some people have become concerned over the fragmentation involved in separating the different functions as they were done in projects like JOBS-I, and have suggested that it might be desirable to have a single staff member perform all the different functions. This would help the trainee see the relevance of all his learning to his chances in the job world. While theoretically this suggestion has much to support it, it would raise problems to the extent that it may be asking staff people to perform some functions that are difficult for them to fulfill. It may not be realistic to expect to find people who can successfully integrate the very different functions and personal styles required in the three different roles.

Some Further Questions on Reactions to the Project Staff

Because the relationship between staff and trainee is critical in programs such as this, a number of other questions were asked about the trainees' reactions to the staff beyond the question of how important each staff member was. This area was most extensively covered at the time the program was ending in June of 1964. At that time a questionnaire was given to all of the trainees still in the program, in which they were asked to respond to a large series of questions about their counselor, their basic education teacher and, in the case of the vocational education units, their teacher of vocational education. These questions were asked at the time of the program's ending to get the trainees' evaluation of staff members at the time when they could evaluate them from the perspective of their total program experience and before their reactions could be colored by their later experience in the post-program world.

The same set of questions was asked the trainee about each of his three staff members. These questions were designed to tap five dimensions which we felt would be significant in the relationship of the trainee and the staff member.

Three of these dimensions have been particularly significant in social-psychological studies as characteristics that affect the extent to which one individual can have influence over another. We have adopted these dimensions from the social psychological literature on influence, since this issue is of primary interest to us in this study, where a major concern is the potential for influence of staff over trainee. In the social psychological studies, such influence has been viewed as a function of the attraction of the influencer for the person being influenced, the degree of competence and expert knowledge the influencer is seen as having, and the degree of power he is seen as having. This latter characteristic, the influencer's power, is particularly important in hierarchical situations where the amount of power the influencing person has with respect to the general social system has important implications with respect to how much he can do for the person he is attempting to teach and influence.

Thus, three of the major dimensions we measured in looking at the trainee's relationship with the staff member were the trainee's attraction to the staff member, his perception of the staff member's influence, and his perception of the staff member's knowledge. The latter two were each measured by a single question. The staff member's influence was measured by a question which asked "how much say do you think __________ has around the unit"? and the trainee checked one of five alternatives ranging from "he has the most say around here" to "he has very little say." The trainee's perception of the staff member's competence and knowledge was measured by his responses to a five-point scale ranging from "he knows just about everything" to "he doesn't know very much."

The trainee's attraction to the staff member was measured by an index consisting of responses to four questions which emerged as a single factor in a factor analysis of the whole set of questions. These four questions asked the trainees to rate the staff member on five-point scales indicating how much they "liked the staff member," how much they "trusted him," how "close and free to bring up personal problems with him" they felt, and "how much they wanted to be like him." Thus, attraction to the staff member is made up of elements of liking, trust, a feeling of closeness and ability to share one's personal problems, and the desire to identify and be like him.

In addition to these three dimensions, we were also interested, particularly because of the counselor's special role, in the whole issue of the staff member as the "middle-class" socializer. In five questions the trainee was asked to indicate how much the staff member had stressed the following job-relevant "middle-class" characteristics in his work with the trainees: that the trainee should "be on time," that he should "take initiative," that he should "work hard," that he should "dress well," and that he should "get along well with others." The responses to these questions were very highly correlated and were, therefore, combined into a single index that we have labeled the "trainees' perception of the staff members' stress on 'middle-class' behaviors."

Since it was felt that the staff member's manner and style would affect his impact as a socializer, we were also interested in a fifth dimension of the trainee-staff relationship, specifically, the extent to which the trainee perceived the staff member as benign or punitive. This dimension was measured by a question asking the trainee to rate the punitiveness of the staff member on a five-point scale from "he uses more punishment than he should" to "he almost never uses punishment."

How were the different types of staff members differentially perceived and reacted to by the trainees? The answers to this question are presented in Tables 9 and 10 which relate the position of the staff member to the trainee's reactions and answers on these five different scales. Table 9 presents the data for the male trainees and Table 10 the data for the female trainees. Since, as we will discuss more fully later, the race of the staff member has been considered a critical factor in the trainee's reactions to him, Table 9 presents the male trainee's reactions separately for Negro and white male staff. Since there were only a handful of female white staff in the project, the Negro-white distinction could not be made with respect to the female trainees. However, it was felt that here the sex distinction might be of interest. Therefore, Table 10 presents the reactions of the female trainees separately for Negro male staff and Negro female staff.

Turning first to the data presented for the male trainees in Table 9, a number of interesting results may be noted. First, we might note that the greater positive feeling about the counselor that we discussed in a preceding section of this chapter is true only with respect to the Negro counselor. If we look at these Negro male trainees' reactions to the Negro male staff, we see that they were more attracted to the counselor than to the education or workshop teachers and also tended to see the counselor as less punitive. (The differences are statistically significant in the counselor-vocational instructor comparisons.) In their reactions to the white staff members, on the other hand, there was no relationship between the staff member's position and the trainee's attraction toward him or perception of his punitiveness. Thus, the greater positiveness of the counselor role appears to be true only with respect to the Negro staff member.

In contrast to the fact that Negro and white staff members do not share the positive aspects of the counselor role, at least in the eyes of the trainees, they do seem to share the negative aspects of the role. Both white and Negro counselors were seen as having less power and influence in the project than either of their more content-oriented counterparts. In addition, the white counselor was also seen as having less knowledge than the white education or workshop teacher.

The tendency of the trainees to see the counselor as more attractive, while at the same time less influential, is consistent with the findings that were discussed in the preceding section of this chapter where we noted that the counselor was seen as the most important staff member because of the personal aspects of his relationship with the trainee, while at the same time counseling sessions were not seen as very significant. The counselor, in short, seems to be seen very positively as a personal figure even though he doesn't "do" much. (The fact that the positive aspect is true for the Negro counselor but not for the white counselor will be more fully discussed in a later section of this chapter.)

Turning to the data on the trainees' perceptions of the staff members' stress on "middle-class" behaviors, the findings suggest that perception of this socializing stress does not seem to have any necessary evaluative positive or negative connotation in the minds of the trainees. Here, again, the perceptions seem to follow the role of the staff member. The stress is perceived to be greatest in the counselor, whose role it was to teach these things. It is interesting that, particularly among the Negro staff members, the staff member who was most attractive was also seen most often as stressing these middle-class

TABLE 9

Relation of Position of Staff to Trainees' Reactions to Staff: For Male Trainees, Separately for Negro Male and White Male Staff

	Negro Male Staff			White Male Staff		
	Counselor (N = 93)	Basic Education Teacher (N = 100)	Vocational Education Teacher (N = 54)	Counselor (N = 51)	Basic Education Teacher (N = 32)	Vocational Education Teacher (N = 20)
Trainees' Attraction to Staff Member: Means on scales from 4 (most attraction) to 20 (least attraction)	9.93	10.42	11.54	11.96	11.17	12.16
	Counselors vs Voc Ed p = .05*			All NS		
Trainees' Perception of Staff Members' Influence: Means on scales from 1 (most influence) to 5 (least influence)	3.27	2.61	2.80	3.86	2.87	3.05
	Counselors vs Basic Ed p = .01 Counselors vs Voc Ed p = .01			Counselors vs Basic Ed p = .01 Counselors vs Voc Ed p = .01		
Trainees' Perception of Staff Members' Knowledge: Means on scales from 1 (most knowledge) to 5 (least knowledge)	2.42	2.30	2.45	3.06	2.32	2.37
	All NS			Counselors vs Basic Ed p = .01 Counselors vs Voc Ed p = .05		
Trainees' Perception of Staff Members' Punitiveness: Means on scales from 1 (most punitiveness) to 5 (least punitiveness)	4.32	3.93	3.37	4.20	3.87	4.05
	Counselors vs Voc Ed p = .01 Basic Ed vs Voc Ed p = .05			All NS		
Trainees' Perception of Staff Members' Stress on "Middle-Class" Behaviors: Means on scales from 5 (least "middle-class" stress) to 25 (most "middle-class" stress)	19.35	18.58	17.63	17.43	17.04	15.78
	Counselors vs Voc Ed p = .10			All NS		

*p values are presented for all differences between two Negro or two white staff members that showed t-tests significant at the .01, .05 or .10 levels. When not presented in the table, the t-tests were not significant.

behaviors. This suggests that the stress on these behaviors was not negatively reacted to by the trainees. This is an important issue since there has been a great deal of concern over the possible boomerang effects of these socializing attempts. This issue will also be explored somewhat more fully in a later section of this chapter.

As a final comment in Table 9, we might note some of the distinctions between the basic education and vocational education teachers. There were no consistent differences in the way the trainees perceived their knowledge or influence or punitiveness. There were some suggested differences (though not statistically significant) in the other two scales. There was a tendency for the basic education teacher to be somewhat more attractive and more often seen as a teacher of middle-class values. This again is consistent with some of the earlier findings discussed in this chapter where we noted that the basic education teacher partakes of some of the broader more personal role qualities of the counselor in his relationship with the trainee, in contrast to the vocational education teacher who is seen much more strictly in his skill-teaching role.

In Table 10 we turn to the women trainees' reaction to their staff members. As noted earlier, we could not investigate the reactions to the race of the staff members since only a handful of white female staff were in the project. The distinction, therefore, is by sex of staff. We should also note that we do not have data with respect to vocational education teachers because there were only a handful of women in that role.

The most striking overall finding in Table 10 is that the women trainees reacted very similarly to women staff members regardless of their particular role position, but reacted very differently to the male staff members in the different roles. The male counselor, when contrasted to the male education teacher, shows the advantages and disadvantages of the more personal counselor role. He tended to be seen as more attractive and less punitive but also as less influential and knowledgeable, the pattern that has already become familiar from our previous discussion.

With respect to women staff members, as we have already noted, it is interesting that these relationships do not obtain. The personal quality of the counselor role may be particularly important in defining the behavior and relationships of the male staff member, since interpersonal sensitivity and understanding are not necessarily part of the male role. However, the relationship between a woman staff member and a woman trainee may acquire such a personal quality regardless of the formal role definition, leading to less differentiated role-related reactions on the part of trainees to women than to male staff members. Again, we will return to these issues in a fuller discussion below.

Up to now, our discussion of the different roles has been based on findings that derive from the trainees' comments about the staff members and the trainee-staff relationship. It is of interest to see whether these findings are corroborated by data obtained from the staff members themselves. How are the kinds of differences between counselors and the other staff members reflected in the characteristics and attitudes presented by the staff members themselves?

In June of 1964, as the project was approaching its end, questionnaires were administered to all of the staff people involved in the project. The questionnaires included a number of questions that tap attitudes and values that might be relevant to some of the role distinctions that have been discussed in

TABLE 10

Relation of Position of Staff to Trainees' Reactions to Staff:
For Female Trainees, Separately for Negro Male and Negro Female Staff

	Negro Male Staff		Negro Female Staff	
	Counselor (N = 52)	Education Teacher (N = 58)	Counselor (N = 87)	Education Teacher (N = 43)
Trainees' Attraction to Staff Members: Means on scales from 4 (most attraction) to 20 (least attraction)	10.24	12.11	10.12	10.36
	p = .01		p = NS	
Trainees' Perception of Staff Members' Influence: Means on scales from 1 (most influence) to 5 (least influence)	3.22	2.54	3.08	3.02
	p = .01		p = NS	
Trainees' Perception of Staff Members' Knowledge: Means on scales from 1 (most knowledge) to 5 (least knowledge)	2.57	2.11	2.47	2.14
	p = .01		p = .10	
Trainees' Perception of Staff Members' Punitiveness: Means on scales from 1 (most punitiveness) to 5 (least punitiveness)	4.43	3.85	4.34	4.64
	p = .01		p = .10	
Trainees' Perception of Staff Members' Stress on "Middle-Class" Behaviors: Means on scales from 5 (least "middle-class" stress) to 25 (most "middle-class" stress)	19.40	19.27	21.00	20.73
	p = NS		p = NS	

the previous sections of this chapter. Two issues particularly appear to be relevant. One is the issue of identification, the extent to which the staff member identifies with and empathizes with the trainee. The other issue refers to the staff member's socializing role, the extent to which he holds some of the "Protestant Ethic" beliefs and values that he is attempting to transmit to the trainees, particularly as these beliefs and values relate to the world of work.

Table 11 presents the findings relevant to these issues. This table compares the responses of the three different types of staff to five sets of questions relating to beliefs, values and trainee identifications. Since the responses to these questions may vary according to the sex of the staff member, and we are concerned here only with differences according to staff position or role, Table 11 presents findings only for male staff.

Some comment might be made about the measures the results of which are presented in this table. Two of the five measures are scales attempting to tap "Protestant Ethic" beliefs and values. We will discuss these scales more fully in Chapter V when we present the findings on these and other attitudes of the trainees. At this point we might note that both scales are highly interrelated, in general attempting to tap some of the issues that are usually discussed as part of a "Protestant Ethic" ideology - the extent to which a person is future-oriented, committed to the value of hard work and the belief that hard work and skill rather than chance determine the success one has in life, etc.

The other three measures presented in Table 11 are relevant to the issue of the staff member's identification with the trainee. Two of the measures refer to the staff member's identification with the trainee within the hierarchy of the JOBS Project itself. The staff members were presented with a list of people ranging from the two top administrators of the total JOBS Project through various staff positions such as "unit supervisor," "basic education teachers," "counselors," and others down to "trainees," and were asked the following question: "In general, how much say or influence do you think each of the following should have on what goes on in this unit?" For each of the hierarchical levels and jobs listed, then, the staff member was asked to rate the influence he felt the position should have on a five-point scale from "little or no influence" to "a very great deal of influence." Table 11 presents the staff members' responses to this question with respect to both the very top administrators of the project and the trainees.

The fifth measure presented in Table 11 refers to identification with the trainees in a much broader sense, the identification with the trainees as Negroes. We were particularly interested in the stance the staff members took with respect to the issue of collective activity on the part of Negroes. Programs like the JOBS Project are essentially taking an approach to the problem of unemployed inner-city Negroes that stresses individual action and self help. It is of interest, then, to see the extent to which this may preclude a sympathy with more general collective approaches to the problems. As indicative of the stance with regard to this issue, therefore, a question was included in the questionnaire on the respondents' feelings about civil rights demonstrations.

Turning to the results presented in Table 11, we find that on all five measures there was a steady progression of responses with the counselors and vocational teachers taking the two extreme positions and the basic education teachers always in the middle. Although all three types of staff members tended to fall heavily on the "Protestant Ethic" side of the two scales, the counselors did so to a lesser extent, adopting a less extreme stereotyped "middle-class" position. Counselors were also more equalitarian in their views of the control structure when compared with the other two staff positions, particularly the vocational teachers. Counselors felt that the top administrators should have somewhat less power and the trainees more. They also were more positive about the type of collective activity represented in the civil rights demonstrations.

TABLE 11

Relation of Staff Position to Staff Attitudes and Values: Male Staff

	Counselors (N = 13)	Basic Education Teachers (N = 14)	Vocational Education Teachers (N = 33)
Protestant Ethic Values: Means on scale from 4 to 20 with 20 representing greatest acceptance of Protestant Ethic values	15.52	16.23	17.14
	Counselors vs. Voc Ed: p = .10*		
Protestant Ethic Beliefs: Means on scales from 3 to 12 with 3 representing greatest acceptance of Protestant Ethic beliefs	6.50	5.67	4.85
	Counselors vs. Voc Ed: p = .05		
Proportion who feel that civil rights demonstrations help Negroes	93%	83%	67%
	Counselors vs. Voc Ed: p = .05		
Attitudes toward how much influence top administrators of project should have: Means on five-point scales with 1 representing "little or no influence"	3.09	3.25	4.00
	Counselors vs. Voc Ed: p = .05		
Attitudes toward how much influence trainees should have: Means on five-point scales with 1 representing "little or no influence"	2.52	2.08	2.00

*p values are presented for all differences between two staff members that were significant at the .01, .05 or .10 level. When not presented in the table, the p values were not significant.

Thus, the findings from the staff members' questionnaires seem to tie in with those obtained from the trainees. The trainees' feelings that they were more attracted to the counselors and more personally tied to them were mirrored by the counselors' greater feeling of identification and sympathy with the trainee. The findings with respect to the Protestant Ethic values and beliefs are particularly interesting. It will be recalled that the trainees saw the counselors as more often not less often stressing certain middle-class behaviors in the work they did with the trainees. Therefore, the fact that the counselors were somewhat less extreme on these values does not mean that they were opposed to these values or were not interested in transmitting them to the trainees. Rather, what is suggested is that they did not hold these values to the extreme extent that might indicate a rejection of the type of lower class background represented by the trainees.

It should be noted that when we look at some of the background characteristics of the staff members, the counselors represented a much less professional level than did the basic education or vocational teachers. The latter tended to be college graduates with considerable professional experience in their areas. Counselors, on the other hand, tended to be young people still in the process of getting their education, with no previous professional experience.

Given these differences in professional training, it is interesting that the picture we get of the counselor-trainee relationship from both trainee and counselor data to some extent fulfills the ideal that many people hold when they advocate the utilization of subprofessionals in work with inner-city youth. The value of subprofessionals is seen in their greater ability to establish a common cause with trainees and thus a greater ability to communicate and to transmit the training in an atmosphere of acceptance and trust. All of this seems to have occurred in the relationship the counselors were able to establish with the trainees.

But we should also note that the findings we have discussed suggest some of the liabilities in the use of subprofessionals as well as the advantages. While the counselors were more trusted by the trainees, they were also seen as less knowledgeable and influential. People that are trusted but not respected may be limited in their ability to have an influence and impact.

People who have argued for the use of subprofessionals have usually referred to "indigenous" subprofessionals, people whose greater sympathy comes from the fact that they actually come from the same backgrounds as those of the people they serve. Although the counselors were "closer" to the trainees than were the people in the other two roles in the sense of being much closer to the age of the trainees, they do not seem to have been closer in any other social sense, for example, with respect to their race or their socioeconomic background. The significance of these "indigenous" characteristics, particularly the significance of the race of the staff member is a separate issue that will be discussed in the section below.

Significance of Race of Staff

Some of the findings discussed in the preceding section have pointed to the fact that whether or not the staff member is a Negro is in some instances an important factor affecting the trainees' reactions to him.[3] This is related to the more general issue of whether the reaction of a trainee to a staff member is affected by the degree of similarity between staff member and trainee, similarity not only in obvious racial characteristics but similarity in terms of class background, values, culture and sympathies. Most people who have worked in this area have assumed that similarity will affect a staff member's effectiveness in working with a trainee. It is this notion that is behind the rather widespread call for the use of "indigenous" workers in this area.

The underlying assumptions in this point of view have been summarized well by Charles Grosser (1967) in his discussion of the role of the nonprofessional in the manpower development programs.

> The nonprofessional worker indigenous to the population served is seen as a bridge between the institution and the lower-class community . . . . The use of local persons is perhaps the least threatening way of developing rapport with a new client. The indigenous nonprofessional is seen as having mutual interests and common cause with program participants, able to communicate freely with them, and because like them, he is poor, resides in the neighborhood and shares minority group status, common background and language. It is assumed that nonprofessional staff being of the community will not render judgments, either clinical or moral, about client behavior. Local nonprofessionals are often hired because they have succeeded in mastering the intricacies of urban slum life and can teach program participants how to do likewise.

As indicated in this quotation, the supposed effectiveness of the indigenous worker is seen as deriving from many similarities beyond that of race. Race, however, is a critical element in this similarity. The comparison of the reactions of our trainees to white and Negro staff members, therefore, is very relevant to the discussion in this area.

Table 12 compares the reactions of the trainees to white and Negro staff members within each staff role. The data in Table 12 are a reordering of the data that were previously discussed in Table 9, but the reordering helps place the data in a somewhat different perspective and illuminates a finding somewhat obscured in the original presentation. What we see very clearly when the data are presented in Table 12 is that the race of the staff member makes a very critical difference in the counselor role but no significant difference in the other roles. When compared to the white male counselor, the Negro male counselor was much more attractive to the trainees under him and was perceived by them as having more knowledge and influence. The differences are large and significant. In contrast, when Negro and white education and workshop teachers are compared, the differences, though in the same direction, were clearly not as large or significant. Whether or not the staff member is Negro or white does seem to matter in a role that requires a relationship of trust and personal closeness and understanding. It matters less in roles that are less personal and where the major focus is on information and skills that have to be taught.[4]

It is also interesting to observe in Table 12 that the Negro counselor, although more positively viewed, was also more often seen as stressing "middle-class" behaviors than was his white counterpart. This raises the whole question of the relationship between the race of the staff member and his effectiveness in his socializing role.

---

[4] It is interesting to speculate whether these findings would obtain in a study conducted today. In the few years since these data were gathered, there has been an increasing emphasis on black separatism and black pride and a consequent rejection of white "experts." It is possible, then, that in a study done today, white staff members would be less accepted in the teaching as well as the counseling role.

TABLE 12

Relation of Race of Staff to Trainees' Reactions to Staff: Male Trainees

	Counselor Negro Male (N = 93)	Counselor White Male (N = 51)	Basic Education Teacher Negro Male (N = 100)	Basic Education Teacher White Male (N = 32)	Vocational Education Teacher Negro Male (N = 54)	Vocational Education Teacher White Male (N = 20)
Trainees' attraction to staff member: Means on scales from 4 (most attraction) to 20 (least attraction)	9.93	11.96	10.42	11.17	11.54	12.16
	p = .01		p = NS		p = NS	
Trainees' perception of staff members' influence: Means on scales from 1 (most influence) to 5 (least influence)	3.27	3.86	2.61	2.87	2.80	3.05
	p = .01		p = NS		p = NS	
Trainees' perception of staff members' knowledge: Means on scales from 1 (most knowledge) to 5 (least knowledge)	2.42	3.06	2.30	2.32	2.45	2.37
	p = .01		p = NS		p = NS	
Trainees' perception of staff members' punitiveness: Means on scales from 1 (most punitiveness) to 5 (least punitiveness)	4.32	4.20	3.93	3.87	3.37	4.05
	p = NS		p = NS		p = .05	
Trainees' perception of staff members' stress on "middle-class" behaviors: Means on scales from 5 (least "middle-class" stress) to 25 (most "middle-class" stress)	19.35	17.43	18.58	17.04	17.63	15.78
	p = .05		p = NS		p = NS	

One of the arguments for the use of indigenous workers in socializing roles is that they will be more effective as socializers. There would seem to be two minimal requirements for this effectiveness: one would be that the socializer would attempt to socialize; the other that this attempt would bring a positive rather than a resentful reaction in the trainees.

Table 12 indicates that Negro counselors (and to some extent other Negro staff members) were perceived as more often stressing middle-class behaviors. But more important than their stress on these behaviors is the question of how this stress and socializing effort was perceived by the trainees. Do Negro trainees perceive this stress differently if it comes from a Negro or a white staff member?

To answer this question, Table 13 presents data on the correlations between a trainee's perception that a staff member is stressing middle-class behaviors and the trainee's attraction to the staff member. These correlations are presented separately for Negro and white staff members. Thus, Table 13 presents data relevant to the following questions: Is a staff member that is seen as stressing these middle-class behaviors viewed positively or negatively by the trainees; and is this different if this stress is seen as coming from a Negro or white staff member?

TABLE 13

Correlations Between Trainee's Attraction to Staff Member and Perception That Staff Member Stresses "Middle-Class" Behaviors: For Male Trainees, Separately for Negro and White Staff

	Correlations	N
Negro male counselors	+.27*	82
White male counselors	-.04	49
Negro male education teachers	+.16	96
White male education teachers	-.03	25

*p = .05

Looking first at the relationship with respect to the Negro counselor, we see that there is a correlation of +.27 between the extent to which the trainee saw his counselor as stressing middle-class behaviors and the trainee's feeling of attraction to his counselor. That is, a Negro counselor who was seen as stressing these behaviors tended to be viewed positively; these socializing efforts were viewed positively when they came from a Negro counselor. They were perhaps viewed as a sign of the counselor's concern and interest and desire to help the trainee

When we look at the relationship between attraction and perception of the socializing efforts when they came from a white counselor, on the other hand, the figures presented in Table 13 provide a striking contrast. We find a correlation of -.04 or no relationship between the trainee's perception that the white counselor was stressing middle-class behaviors and the trainee's attraction to the counselor.

Whatever might be viewed as positive in the counselor's stress on these behaviors is vitiated when he is white. Resentment on the trainee's part seems to have counterbalanced what might otherwise have been a positive reaction.

We should note that it is this particular relationship - the relationship between attraction to a staff member and perception that he stresses middle-class behaviors - and only this relationship that differentiated the trainee's reactions to white and Negro counselors. When we look at the relationship between attraction and the other scales measuring trainees' reactions to staff members, we find the correlations are the same for both Negro and white staff members. For example, in both cases there was a positive relationship between attraction to a staff member and the perception of his influence (+.50 for Negro counselors and +.44 for white) and between attraction and the perceived knowledge and competence of the staff member (+.54 for Negro counselors and +.59 for white counselors). It is only when we look at the reaction to the socializing efforts of the staff member that we get a striking difference according to the race of the counselor. Apparently the stress on middle-class behaviors gets a different meaning when it comes from a white as opposed to a Negro staff member. Elements of resentment seem to arise in the trainee's reactions to a white counselor that do not appear in reactions to a Negro staff member and counterbalance whatever positive reaction there might be to the staff members' socializing efforts. At least in this respect the data support the argument that socializing efforts will be more effective when they come from people seen as "similar," and that they may boomerang when seen as imposed from a representative of an alien "superior" culture.

We have focused in this discussion on the counselor role since that is the one devoted most exclusively to the socializing function. However, as we have already noted, the basic education teacher also was somewhat concerned with these issues and Table 13 also presents data with relation to that role. We see in these data that the findings are similar to those that were discussed in relation to the counselor role, although the relationships are not as large. There is some positive relationship between a trainee's perception that the education teacher is stressing middle-class behaviors and the trainee's attraction to that teacher when the teacher is Negro (correlation of +.16) but no relationship when the teacher is white (correlation of -.03).

The above findings all derive from data about the staff members and the trainee-staff relationship that came from the trainee. These data suggest a greater sympathy and communication between Negro trainee and staff member, particularly when the Negro is a counselor. It is of interest, however, to see whether these findings are corroborated by data obtained from the staff members themselves, whether in fact Negro and white staff members did differ in their empathy and understanding of the trainees, or whether trainees were reacting to subtle assumptions of differences because of race. Grosser in his discussion of the role of the indigenous nonprofessional notes that there is a tendency to over-idealize what such a person is or might be and points out that the attitudes and beliefs of such people might actually be very judgmental and moralistic regarding the behavior of the local target area residents.

Table 14 presents a comparison between the responses of white and Negro staff members to the same set of questions we discussed above when we were comparing counselors, basic education and vocational education teachers (see Table 11). These questions, it will be recalled, relate to the staff members' position on certain Protestant Ethic values and beliefs, their attitudes toward the control structure within the JOBS Project and the proper place they feel the trainees should play in it, and their stance with respect to collective Negro activity as represented in civil rights demonstrations. When we compare Negro and white staff members in their responses to these questions, there is a clear difference on the last mentioned item; although a majority of all staff members felt that civil rights demonstrations have a positive effect, this was much more true with respect to the Negro staff members. On all the other measures presented in Table 14, however, there were no differences according to the race of the staff members. Negro and white staff members did not differ in their adherence to the Protestant Ethic beliefs and values as measured in the study, nor in their attitudes on the amount of power that trainees,as opposed to top administrative members, should have in the JOBS Project.

TABLE 14

Relation of Race of Staff to Staff Attitudes and Values: Male Staff

	Male Negro Staff (N = 41)		Male White Staff (N = 24)
Protestant Ethic Values: Means on scales from 4 to 20 with 20 representing greatest acceptance of Protestant Ethic values	15.92	p = NS	16.00
Protestant Ethic Beliefs: Means on scales from 3 to 12 with 3 representing greatest acceptance of Protestant Ethic beliefs	5.69	p = NS	6.30
Proportion who feel that civil rights demonstrations help Negroes	92%	p = .01	65%
Attitudes toward how much influence top administrators of project should have: Means on five-point scales with 1 representing "little or no influence"	3.25	p = NS	3.33
Attitudes toward how much influence trainees should have: Means on five-point scales with 1 representing "little or no influence"	2.32	p = NS	2.08

It might be argued that the measures of middle-class values and beliefs and identifications with trainees that are represented in this table are too simple and crude to tap any differences that really may exist. However, it should be noted that they were sensitive enough to demonstrate differences between counselors and other staff members. The lack of differences at least suggests that differences between Negro and white staff members in these areas may not be as striking or obvious as they were with respect to counselors and other staff members. The findings are at least suggestive, then, that the greater ability of Negro staff to elicit trust from the trainees, particularly in the counselor role, may not be tied to obvious attitudinal and value differences from white staff members but, rather, may come simply from the fact that they are Negro and the feelings of common identification that this elicits in the trainees. These data are suggestive that, at least in the present stage of history, Negroes can more effectively fill certain roles with these inner-city Negro youths, and the fact of being white creates certain difficulties in these roles, regardless of the attitudes and sympathies of the particular persons filling them.

As we have already indicated, this does not necessarily apply to all roles and functions, particularly those that are restricted to the transmission of knowledge and skills. But it does seem to be true for roles involving personal closeness and trust, and where the socializing function is paramount.

Significance of Sex of Staff

In the current discussion of the need to get staff members that are "similar" to the trainees, much less has been made of the issue of similarity with respect to sex than has been made with respect to race. We have already noted, however, that the responses of women trainees did seem to be affected by whether they are interacting with a male or a female staff member. In this section we will explore a little more some of the issues that were briefly noted in our previous discussion.

In our discussion of the importance of race of staff member, it was noted that race was important not as a general issue, but only in specific roles, particularly that trainees' reactions to white and Negro staff members were very different in the counselor role but not significantly different in the other two roles (see Table 12). We may ask a similar question with respect to the relevance of sex of staff member for the women trainees. Table 15 presents the reactions of the trainees to male and female staff members in the counselor and basic education teacher roles. This is essentially a reordering of the data that were previously presented in Table 10 above, only a reordering that helps highlight the issue of whether the difference sex makes depends upon the particular staff role. As indicated above, we do not include vocational educators in Table 15 because very few of these were women.

The findings presented in Table 15 indicate that, as was true in our discussion of the impact of race, whether or not sex of staff member makes a difference depends upon the particular role the staff member is fulfilling. The contrast with the findings on race that were previously discussed is interesting, however. In the previous discussion we noted that race made a difference with respect to the counselor role. We now see in the data presented in Table 15 that sex did not make a significant difference in the counselor role but did in the basic education teacher role. Apparently a man in the counselor role can get the trust, attraction and confidence of women trainees equally as well as a woman in that role. The male education teacher, however, does not receive the attraction, confidence and trust that a woman in that role receives.

These somewhat surprising findings might be better understood if we think not in terms of liabilities that a man in the educational role has, but rather in terms of the special assets that a woman brings to that role. We have noted in our previous discussion that very often the basic education teacher partakes somewhat of the counselor role, to some extent becoming a personal counselor as well as an education teacher. What is suggested in the data presented in Table 15

TABLE 15

Relationship of Sex of Staff to Trainees' Reactions to Staff: Female Trainees

	Counselor Negro Male (N = 52)	Counselor Negro Female (N = 87)	Basic Education Teacher Negro Male (N = 58)	Basic Education Teacher Negro Female (N = 43)
Trainees' Attraction to Staff Member: Means on scales from 4 (most attraction) to 20 (least attraction)	10.24	10.12	12.11	10.36
	p = NS		p = .05	
Trainees' Perception of Staff Members' Influence: Means on scales from 1 (most influence) to 5 (least influence)	3.22	3.08	2.54	3.02
	p = NS		p = .05	
Trainees' Perception of Staff Members' Knowledge: Means on scales from 1 (most knowledge) to 5 (least knowledge)	2.57	2.47	2.11	2.14
	p = NS		p = NS	
Trainees' Perception of Staff Members' Punitiveness: Means on scales from 1 (most punitiveness) to 5 (least punitiveness)	4.43	4.34	3.85	4.64
	p = NS		p = .01	
Trainees' Perception of Staff Members' Stress on "Middle-Class" Behaviors: Means on scales from 5 (least "middle-class" stress) to 25 (most "middle-class" stress)	19.40	21.00	19.27	20.73
	p = .10		p = NS	

is that this can happen much more often when the education teacher is a woman working with a woman trainee than when the education teacher is a man. It is possible that the data in Table 15 indicate not that the man education teacher is personally rejected, but rather that he maintains his strictly educational role to a greater extent than is true of the woman teacher. Thus, he would less often fulfill a relationship of personal trust, would less often be seen as personally attractive, and would more often be seen as somewhat punitive, punitiveness being something that goes more with a strictly teaching role than one that involves the personal understanding and trust of the counselor role.

It is interesting, if we take this view, that the male education teacher, if he does not get some of the benefits of the counselor role, also seems to avoid some of its liabilities. It will be recalled that counselors, while more attractive to trainees, were also seen as less influential in the JOBS Project's system. We see in Table 15 that the male education teacher, while less attractive, was also seen as more influential than the female teacher. Thus, if the female education teacher fulfills a great deal of the personalness of the counselor role, she not only gets greater trust and attractiveness but also is seen as less influential.

The implications one would draw from Table 15 are not as clear as those deriving from the findings with respect to race of staff member. What one would do would depend upon the role one wished the education teacher to fulfill in a given project. If we would want a teacher to play somewhat of a counselor role, it would seem from the data that this could more easily be done by a woman, at least with women trainees. Where the role is clearly structured as one of personal involvement and support, the sex of the staff member appears to be less relevant.

What the findings from Table 15 do suggest is that a woman staff member would be better at performing a multiple role with women trainees, a role where the staff member was asked to combine personal and educational functions. This can be particularly important for projects at this time because, as we have already noted, there is considerable current support for the argument that staff positions should cover a multiplicity of roles, i.e., the same person being teacher and skill trainer and counselor, rather than separating these roles as was done in the project we are discussing in this report. Table 15 suggests that it might be particularly important to consider the issue of the sex of the staff member when the role combined these multiple functions, at least when dealing with women trainees.

As a final issue we turn now to the question of the differential effectiveness of male and female staff members in their socializing efforts with female trainees. It will be recalled from the preceding discussion (see Table 13) that these efforts were positively reacted to by men trainees when the staff member was Negro but not when the staff member was white. Table 16 presents the parallel data looking at sex rather than race of staff members as the critical variable. This table presents the correlation between a woman trainee's attraction to a staff member and the perception that the staff member stresses middle-class behaviors and values, looking at this correlation separately for men and women staff members.

We see clearly in Table 16 that the sex of the staff member is a critical variable affecting the trainees' reactions to the staff members' stress on middle-class behaviors. When the staff member was a woman there was a very clear positive relationship between the trainee's perception that the staff member was stressing these middle-class behaviors and the trainee's attraction to that staff member (correlation of +.36 for the basic education teacher and +.22 for the counselors). When the staff member was a man, however, there was no significant relationship between the trainee's perception of his middle-class stress and the trainee's attraction to the staff member (correlation of +.07 for the basic education teachers and -.01 for counselors).

TABLE 16

Correlations Between Trainee's Attraction to Staff Member and Perception that Staff Member Stresses "Middle-Class" Behaviors: For Female Trainees, Separately for Male and Female Staff

	Correlations	N
Negro female counselors	+.22*	80
Negro male counselors	-.01	47
Negro female education teachers	+.36*	38
Negro male education teachers	+.07	53

*p = .05

In this sense, then, sex of staff member seems to have the same meaning for female trainees that race has for the male trainees. When these socializing efforts are seen as coming from a woman, they are positively perceived. When they are seen as coming from a man, whatever positive element is involved appears to be counteracted by resistance and resentment. In a sense women trainees seem to be reacting to men in their socializing role as "aliens" in a similar way that male trainees as Negroes reacted to white staff members in the socializing role. For the socializing function, then, it appears that, at least for women trainees, similarity in sex between staff and trainee may be as important a consideration as the much more widely discussed similarity with respect to race.

Summary

This chapter examined the reactions of the trainees to the three different aspects of the JOBS-I Project - counseling, basic education and vocational education - and the three corresponding staff members.

The attempt to assess reactions to the vocational education aspect of the program was complicated by the fact that the trainees in the on-the-job training wing of the project essentially received no skill training, since their OJT placements did not materialize. Moreover, even the trainees in the institutional part of the program, who did receive skill training, in most instances did not find jobs in these skills in the period after they left the program. In spite of these considerations, it was clear that skill training is the most central concern of trainees who come to these programs, even when counseling and basic education receive heavy emphasis. Trainees who were trained in job-relevant skills saw this as the major aspect of the program. When no skill training was available, motivation sharply decreased.

Reactions to basic education were more bipolar. A number of trainees viewed it as important and helpful but many also considered it a waste of time. Trainees did not reject the idea of going back to school per se, but they often questioned the relevance of the basic education to their occupational interests. Trainees rarely mentioned basic education as helpful in the post-program job world. The findings underscore the need, in basic education courses, of pointing up their job relevance to the trainees.

The trainees' attitudes toward the counseling aspect of the program were complex. Although they saw behaviors and attitudes as relevant in the job world, they seemed relatively indifferent to the formal aspects of the counseling sessions. The counselors were seen as less knowledgeable and influential than the other two staff people. However, the counselor as a person was the most important and positive staff member to them. The counselors were important not as group leaders and socializers but because of the supportive personal relationships they established with the individual trainees. Training programs should probably encourage counselors in this supportive personal role. It not only appears to be what the trainees need, but also may be more appropriate to the subprofessional status of most of the counselors in these programs. The role of socializer and group therapy leader requires a level of training and technical skill that most people in these roles have not yet achieved.

In contrast to the personal reaction to the counselors, vocational educators were singled out for their teaching skills and what they had taught, whereas basic education teachers were viewed as somewhere in between these two extremes, receiving positive reactions for both their teaching and their personal support. These findings reflect some obvious differences in function among the three roles. They also seem to reflect differences in the people filling the roles. The greater personal involvement of the counselors was probably related to the fact that they were closer to the trainees in age and background and more empathic with the trainee's perspective in some of the attitudes they expressed. The fact that vocational teachers seemed less able than basic education teachers to combine a personal and a teaching role probably reflects the fact that they came from vocational backgrounds and were not oriented to the interpersonal aspect of the teacher-trainee relationship. Given these indications that the roles have different requirements and that these fit the orientations of the staff people filling the roles, these data question the advisability of suggestions which have advocated combining these three functions in a single role.

The complexity of the trainees' reactions to the staff members was illustrated in an analysis of the impact of race and sex. The race of the staff member was important only in certain roles and functions: male trainees responded more positively to Negro staff members only in the counselor role which demands personal closeness and trust and they reacted more positively to "middle-class" socializing pressures when they came from Negro staff members. For women trainees, the sex of the staff member also was important depending on role and function. These findings qualify the assumption behind the argument for indigenous workers that trainees will respond more positively to staff members who are similar to them on critical background variables. This is true only to the extent that this similar background is relevant to the staff member's role and functions.

CHAPTER III

Two Criteria of Success

Many subtle and difficult issues arise when we attempt to establish criteria for judging the "success" of a given program. There are two criteria, however, which have generally been accepted by manpower training programs. Both of these have been used as the basis for the major analyses of the data in this study.

One criterion, the most obvious and unambiguous, is the trainee's job earnings in the period following his program experience. While a person's earnings may not be the only criterion of his success in utilizing his program experience, it should clearly be accepted as at least one very significant criterion. Regardless of a program's concern with issues of literacy and motivations, the training programs are, after all, directed toward improving trainees' chances and opportunities in the job market and, ultimately, this has to be the major criterion by which they are judged.

The other criterion by which training programs have been judged has been their ability to keep trainees committed to the program, with "dropout" at least to some extent viewed as a failure. There has been some controversy over whether the failure is one of the individual in the program or of the program itself, but the general alarm over the dropout that is expressed in our society attests to the fact that we view it as a failure. It is a failure, however, in a much more ambiguous sense than is true of the criterion of post-program earnings. The meaning of remaining in a program is particularly unclear. We can perhaps accept the notion that dropping out is an indication that in some way a given program failed to "reach" the individual toward which it was directed. It is not at all clear that an individual's remaining in a program indicates that the program was successful in reaching him. This is particularly true in experimental and demonstration programs like the JOBS Project, where efforts are more directed toward keeping people in the program than toward screening out those who are not really benefiting from it.[1]

We were interested, therefore, in distinguishing between those trainees whose remaining in the program represented an active commitment to it and what it was attempting to do, and those who remained passively, whose staying with the program was more an indication that they lacked any other alternatives than a positive, active commitment to the program. One way of making this distinction was provided by the fact that the JOBS Project staff was not uniformly successful in placing all of its program graduates. Among the 524 trainees who completed the training, a little over half (292) were placed prior to September 4, 1964, the end of training. The other 232 who completed training but were not placed by September 4 were either placed at a later time or were not placed at all.[2]

---

[1] It is for this reason that we were not concerned in this study with the distinction between "voluntary" and "nonvoluntary" dropouts. In JOBS-I the trainees who were dismissed from the project were not those of low ability but those whose attendance was so low that essentially they had stopped coming to the project, or those who were too disruptive. In a setting where people are not discharged because of low ability, all dropout is to some extent self-initiated.

In the remainder of this report, these two groups of graduates will be distinguished and considered separately. The group of graduates who were placed by the end of training will be referred to as the "early placed graduates." The other group will be referred to as the "later or nonplaced graduates." It will be noted that this distinction places the later placed people, i.e., those placed between September 4 and November 1, 1964, with the less successful nonplaced group rather than with the more successful early placements. Conceptually, it might have been just as meaningful to combine all placed individuals into one group, whether the placement occurred early or late, and to contrast them with those who were never placed at all. However, our interview sample of the nonplaced graduates was very small, too small to permit systematic comparisons with the dropout and placed groups. By combining the nonplaced graduates with the later placements, we doubled the size of the "less successful" group, making it large enough to permit some systematic group comparisons.

In the chapters that follow, we will be concerned with the factors related to these two criteria: success after the end of the program measured by the trainee's earnings in the job world; and success in the program as indicated by whether the trainee dropped out, remained in the program and graduated with a placement upon graduation, or stayed with the program to the end but without getting placed until later or perhaps not getting placed at all. These criteria of success, it should again be stressed, are criteria of individual success. We will be using these criteria to compare all the individuals in our sample who went through the JOBS Project experience, for the purpose of understanding some of the factors that make for an individual's lesser or greater success. We will not be utilizing these criteria to characterize the success of this program in contrast to other programs or the success of JOBS Project trainees in contrast to a control group that did not go through the program experience.

Before proceeding in the following chapters to the analysis of the factors related to these two success criteria, we will, in the remainder of this chapter, present some amplifying material on the criteria themselves. We will turn first to the job earnings criterion, indicating how it was measured, its most salient characteristics and some rudimentary validating criteria.

Post-Program Earnings

The Measure of Earnings

Our measure of post-program job earnings was obtained from the trainees in the interviews given during the period from February to May of 1965, six to nine months after the end of the project. A major portion of this final interview was devoted to obtaining a detailed picture of the trainee's job history and earnings after leaving the program. In a series of questions the trainee was directed back to the date he left the program and asked for a detailed, chronological history of all the jobs he had had in that period, giving such information as the dates of beginning and ending the job, the beginning and ending salaries, the periods of unemployment between jobs, etc. On the basis of this information an index of post-program earnings was constructed by computing each trainee's average weekly income during the six-month period between September 1, 1964, when the project ended, and February 1, 1965, when the post-program interviewing began. The total income for that six-month period was summed and then divided by the number of weeks in that period. Thus, a person who was paid $100 per week but only worked for half that period received the same average income score as the person who worked for the entire period but was paid only $50 per week. Trainees who held two jobs concurrently were treated as if they held only one job but at the combined pay rate. Thus, this earnings index is a function of two factors: a person's average wage rate and the amount of time he was employed. We will note at a later point in this chapter the relationship between these two factors and the relative importance of each as a contributor to the total earnings index.[3]

---

[2] The actual figures given in the final report of the first year of the JOBS Project were 118 placed in employment between September 4 and November 1, 1964, the official end of the JOBS-I contract, with the other 114 graduates not placed at all.

One final point should be noted. An index of earnings is obviously meaningful only for people who are in the job market. Among the people whom we contacted in the final interview were a number who were not in the job market for various reasons: some were attending school or another training program full time, a few of the men had been drafted and were in the armed services, a few of the women were pregnant and had a child sometime during that period. All in all, of the 339 people whom we contacted for the final interview, 45 (21 men and 24 women) were not in the job market for at least some part of the six-month period taken as a baseline for our job earnings index. These people, therefore, have been eliminated from all those tables that will be presented in this report in which the earnings index is related to other individual characteristics.

Post-Program Job History

Before discussing the findings relevant to the earnings index specifically, it may be of some interest to look in some detail at the more important characteristics of the trainees' post-program job history as reported by these trainees in their final interview. Table 17 summarizes these characteristics separately for men and women trainees.

If we look first at the findings for the men trainees, we see that most of them had a fairly steady employment history in the period after they left the program. Only a very small number (six percent) had no jobs at all during that period, the great majority (80 percent) having one or two jobs. When we look specifically at the six-month period we have used as our earnings index baseline, we see that almost half of the men (47 percent) worked over 90 percent of that six-month period. The picture with regard to the quality of the jobs obtained, however, is not as positive. The jobs were almost completely those requiring no or minimal skill, more than half of them (54 percent) beginning at an hourly rate of $1.50 or less.

---

[3] It will be noted that we have taken a common six-month period for this index, even though not all trainees left the project when it formally ended the beginning of September. For those who dropped out of the program before graduation, the six-month baseline period we chose occurred at some point after they left the JOBS Project. We chose a common six-month period rather than the six-month period immediately following the time any given individual left the program in order to avoid the error that would have been introduced by the fact that jobs might have been more available at one period than another. To see whether there was any error introduced by using the common six-month period, we computed an index for each trainee based on the period from the time he individually left the program until February 1, 1965. The correlations between this measure and the index based on the common six-month period were .96 for men and .92 for women. The size of these correlations suggests that no significant error was introduced by utilizing the common period as the baseline for constructing our index.

The picture is less favorable when we look at the experience of the women trainees presented in Table 17. Their employment history was both more fragmentary and less rewarded. The lower rewards are clear. Women got jobs averaging at a lower hourly rate. Seventy-two percent of the women, contrasted with 54 percent of the men, went from the JOBS Project to a job at $1.50 an hour or less.

The findings in Table 17 with respect to the steadiness of employment are somewhat more complex. It is clear that on the average women worked less than the men. In the six-month baseline period, 46 percent of the women, in contrast to 32 percent of the men, worked half the time or less. But most of this difference can be attributed to the differences in the numbers who had no jobs at all in the post-program period - 24 percent of the women in contrast to six percent of the men. It is not due to differences in the amount of time women worked on a job once they got it. If anything, women spent somewhat more time on the first job they got after leaving the program: 32 percent of the men, in contrast to 21 percent of the women, spent two months or less on this job.

There is another factor in this difference between men and women. Although women stay on their first job somewhat longer than men, if they did leave the job, they less often went to a second job. Thus, it is not only that women more often had no jobs than men; they also less often went to a second job after the first job ended. This is clear if we look at the figures on post-program jobs, considering only the people who had any jobs at all. Among the men we find that 47 percent had one job and an equal number (47 percent) had two jobs or more in the period after they left the program. Among the women, however, 56 percent had one job and only 20 percent had two jobs or more. These figures are further reflected in the total time worked in the six-month period following the end of the program: 41 percent of the men, in contrast to only 25 percent of the women, worked the total time during that period.

Significantly, there was also a slight difference in the kind of move that seemed to be involved when men and women trainees went on to a second job. For the men this seemed to be a move to a somewhat better job; for the women it did not seem to represent any improvement. This is suggested in Table 18 which compares the beginning pay of the first and second post-program jobs of trainees who had at least two jobs. Among the men the second job tended to represent some improvement (although the difference is not statistically significant); for example, whereas 36 percent of the first jobs of these trainees began at an hourly rate of $1.25 or less, this was true of only 23 percent of their second jobs. Among the women no such difference appears. Although the second jobs of the women were somewhat more often at the relatively high pay of over $2.00 an hour, they were also more often at the lower paid levels of $1.50 or less.

In summary, the picture presented by the data in Tables 17 and 18 is one of greater passivity in the job market among the women trainees. They more

TABLE 17

Post-Program Job History of Male and Female Trainees

		Male Trainees	Female Trainees
Number of full-time jobs after leaving program	None	6%	24%
	One	47	56
	Two	33	15
	Three or more	14	5
		100%	100%
		(N = 183)	(N = 149)
		Chi^2 = 37.4664, 3 df p = .001	
Proportion of time worked in six-month period following end of program	10% or less	12%	29%
	11% to 25%	7	7
	26% to 50%	13	10
	51% to 75%	11	14
	76% to 90%	10	10
	91% to 99%	6	5
	100%	41	25
		100%	100%
		(N = 179)	(N = 148)
		Chi^2 = 15.385, 3 df* p = .01	
Starting pay on first job after leaving program	$1.25 or less	27%	33%
	$1.26 to $1.50	27	39
	$1.51 to $1.75	17	18
	$1.76 to $2.00	14	5
	Over $2.00	15	5
		100%	100%
		(N = 162)	(N = 117)
		Chi^2 = 15.567, 3 df** p = .01	
Number of months spent on first job after leaving program	One month or less	22%	15%
	One to two months	10	6
	Two to three months	8	8
	Three to four months	10	10
	Four to five months	6	6
	Five to six months	4	6
	More than six months (no longer on job at time of interview)	6	9
	More than six months (still on job at time of interview)	34	40
		100%	100%
		(N = 170)	(N = 118)
		Chi^2 = 3.561, 2 df*** p = NS	

TABLE 17 (Cont)

*Distributions were combined into the following categories for computing the significance test: 25% or less, 26% to 75%, 76% to 99%, and 100%. In this table and the others in this chapter relating to data on wage rates and duration of employment the chi-square test has been used in preference to the t-test of significance of differences between means in order to avoid giving undue weight to extreme scores.

**Distributions were combined into the following categories: $1.25 or less, $1.26 to $1.50, $1.51 to $1.75, and over $1.75.

***Distributions were combined into the following categories: two months or less, more than two months but no longer on job at time of interview, more than six months and still on job at time of interview.

TABLE 18

Comparison of Beginning Pay on First and Second Post-Program Jobs of Trainees Who Had at Least Two Jobs After Leaving Program

	Males (N = 91)		Females (N = 36)	
Starting Pay	First Post-Program Job	Second Post-Program Job	First Post-Program Job	Second Post-Program Job
$1.25 or less	36%	23%	43%	44%
$1.26 to $1.50	19	21	28	36
$1.51 to $1.75	18	20	20	6
$1.76 to $2.00	8	11	3	3
Over $2.00	19	25	6	11
	100%	100%	100%	100%
	$\text{Chi}^2 = 3.999$, df = 4*		$\text{Chi}^2 = 2.282$, df = 4*	
	p = NS		p = NS	

*Highest two categories combined for computing significance.

often had no jobs at all. When they did get a job, they tended to stay with it longer, even though it was less well paid than the jobs of the men trainees. When they did leave their first job, they less often moved on to another job and when they did nove, it was less often a movement to something better.

The combination of working less and for lower pay adds up to a clear difference between the men and women trainees when we compare them on their average weekly earnings in the six-month period following the end of the JOBS Project. This comparison is presented in Table 19. Average weekly earnings were computed by summing the total income for that six-month period and dividing by the number of weeks in that period.

The figures in Table 19 clearly indicate the relative disadvantage of the women trainees: 27 percent of the male trainees, in contrast to only three percent of the women, averaged over seventy dollars a week during that period.

These differences occurred despite the fact that, as we will note later, the women trainees had, if anything, more educational background than the men trainees in this program and performed somewhat higher in the tests administered by the JOBS Project measuring verbal and mathematical skills and intelligence. Much has been made of the matriarchal nature of the Negro family structure and the special frustrations in the situation of the Negro man. It is interesting to note, therefore, that this does not prevent us finding in our population of trainees the same discriminatory job situation for women that obtains in the general society.

TABLE 19

Average Weekly Earnings in Six-Month Period Following End of JOBS Project: For Male and Female Trainees

	Male Trainees (N = 179)	Female Trainees (N = 149)
$10 or less	16%	34%
$11 to $20	7	6
$21 to $30	8	7
$31 to $40	7	10
$41 to $50	8	10
$51 to $60	16	20
$61 to $70	11	10
$71 to $80	10	1
$81 to $90	7	0
Over $90	10	2
	100%	100%

$\text{Chi}^2 = 42.863$, df = 3*
p = .001

*Distributions were divided into the following categories for computing the significance test: $10 or less, $11 to $50, $51 to $70, and over $70.

Comparison of Trainee and Supervisor Reports

To simplify our presentation of those findings in this report where we will be relating job earnings to other trainee characteristics, we have divided our population of trainees roughly into quartiles according to their average weekly earnings in the six-month baseline period. Because of the difference between the earnings of the men and women, presented in Table 19 above, the quartile dividing points were different for the men and women trainees. Among the men, the following were the four quartile ranges: $0 to $32 a week, $33 to $55, $56 to $74 and $75 and over. Among the women, they were: $0 to $9, $10 to $37, $38 to $55 and $56 and over.

As we have noted, this index of success measured in terms of post-program earnings, comes from the information given by the trainees in the final interview. Therefore, before exploring what other characteristics this index may be related to, the issue of its validity and the trainees' truthfulness should be explored. How may we evaluate the accuracy of the trainees' reports and, hence, the meaningfulness of the relationships that we will be discussing in this study?

As we indicated in the introductory chapter, we were able to interview approximately 60 percent of the supervisors of the first job the trainees went to after leaving the JOBS Project. The reports of the supervisors, therefore, may provide some validating check on the job history information given us by the trainees.

Table 20 presents such a comparison between supervisor and trainee reports. This table compares these reports on a number of facts about the trainee's first post-program job. The issue in this comparison is not just how much overall agreement or disagreement obtains, but whether disagreement is systematic in such a way that it would affect the relationships between post-program success and other characteristics that we will be exploring in this report. Therefore, in Table 20, where we compare the information about the first job that the trainees and supervisors gave us, we look at these comparisons separately within the four job earning quartiles that we will be utilizing in the remainder of the report. We know that the trainees' information about the first job will vary greatly among the four job earning quartiles since the index of job earnings is built largely on this information about the first job. To the extent, then, that the data given by the supervisors parallel these differences among the quartiles, we gain some confidence in this index and its use in the remainder of the report.

Table 20 presents the comparisons of trainee and supervisor reports on four critical pieces of information about the first job: whether or not the trainee was still on the job at the time of the interview; the starting pay of the job; whether or not the trainee got a pay increase sometime during the job; and, in cases where the trainee was no longer on the job, the reasons for his leaving it. In the first three of these items, we see a striking congruence between trainee and supervisor reports within the four earnings quartiles for both males and females. This is most striking in the case where we might have expected most tendency for trainees to exaggerate, namely, the report of the wage rate on the job. Moreover, agreement in the report on whether the trainee was still on the job at the time of the interview is even greater than it appears to be in Table 20. The small tendency for the supervisors to report less trainees still on the first job is not necessarily a contradiction of the trainees' reports since the supervisors' interview occurred a number of months after the trainees' interview and several trainees left their jobs between the period of their interview and that of the supervisors.

The one area where we get a very different picture from the trainees' and supervisors' reports occurred in response to the question on why the trainee left the first job. The difference appears in the relative weight given to the two categories "fired" and "laid off." In those instances where the trainee left the job at the company's instance rather than his own, the trainee tended to report that it was due to a company layoff in no way reflecting on his own performance, whereas, the supervisor more often reported that the trainee was fired.

TABLE 20

Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Comparisons of Supervisors' and Trainees' Reports on Trainees' First Post-Program Jobs

		Males				Females			
		I Lowest Earnings (N = 15)	II (N = 24)	III (N = 25)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 23)	I Lowest Earnings (N = 7)*	II (N = 15)	III (N = 20)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 22)
Proportion of trainees still on first job at time of trainee interview: Trainees' reports		7%	37%	68%	50%	-	13%	50%	86%
Proportion still on first job at time of supervisor interview: Supervisors' reports		7%	33%	60%	45%	-	20%	35%	73%
Mean starting pay: Trainees' reports		$1.42	$1.31	$1.50	$1.86	-	$1.33	$1.44	$1.47
Mean starting pay: Supervisors' reports		$1.43	$1.34	$1.52	$1.73	-	$1.30	$1.46	$1.48
Proportion getting pay increases: Trainees' reports		36%	54%	84%	76%	-	33%	55%	95%
Proportion getting pay increases: Supervisors' reports		42%	45%	72%	81%	-	33%	44%	95%
Why trainee left first job: Trainees' reports	Fired	13%	4%	8%	0%	-	20%	5%	0%
	Laid off	33	17	16	30	-	54	25	9
	Quit	40	38	4	16	-	13	20	0
	Unknown	7	4	4	4	-	0	0	5
	Still on job	7	37	68	50	-	13	50	86
		100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%
Why trainee left first job: Supervisors' reports	Fired	27%	25%	16%	16%	-	47%	20%	9%
	Laid off	13	4	4	12	-	13	20	5
	Quit	33	29	16	27	-	13	20	9
	Unknown	20	9	4	0	-	7	5	4
	Still on job	7	33	60	45	-	20	35	73
		100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%

*Data for this group not presented because of small N.

It might be noted that even this discrepancy does not necessarily reflect on the truthfulness of the trainees' reports. To some extent the discrepancy may represent a tendency on the part of the supervisors and other company personnel to "cool" people out by telling them there was an unavoidable layoff, rather than by criticizing them for their performance. Furthermore, it should be noted that this particular discrepancy does not affect the index of job earnings that is being utilized as our criterion of success. The earnings index, it will be recalled, is based on information about how much the trainee earned and how long he earned it, and is not affected by the reasons or rationalizations he gave for his employment or lack of employment. It is encouraging, therefore, that the information we obtained from the trainee and supervisor interviews shows the same relationship to the index of jobs earnings in just those areas on which this index of success depends, that is, the reports of earnings, earning increases and duration of employment. We may, therefore, utilize the quartile differentiation of this index of earnings with somewhat more confidence than would have been possible without this corroborating evidence from the supervisors' interviews.

Relative Importance of Wage Rate and Regularity of Employment

Before proceeding in future chapters to a discussion of the characteristics related to the index of earnings, some further discussion of the factors going into this index may be helpful. As we have already noted, this index represents the multiplication of two factors: the amount of time worked and the rate of pay for the work. Which of these two characteristics is more important in determining whether a trainee emerges with a high or low score on this index? To what extent does the distinction between the higher and lower quartiles in post-program earnings represent a distinction between people who can get jobs with higher or lower wage rates, and to what extent is the issue one of the steadiness and regularity of a person's employment history? It is important to know how important each of these factors is in making up the success index, for we might expect that different trainee and program characteristics would be related to an index based mainly on wage rate than would be related to an index based mainly on steadiness of employment.

Table 21 relates the index of post-program earnings to a number of characteristics of the trainees' post-program job history that are relevant to the issues of wage rates and steadiness of employment. We see from this table that both factors are important and contribute to the index of post-program earnings.

Looking first at the data on wage rates, we see that the trainees in the different earnings quartiles differed in the wage rates they started with in their first jobs and that these differentials were maintained among those who left these jobs and went on to a second job.[4] These differences are not very

---

[4] As indicated in Table 21, trainees in the higher earnings quartiles also much more often received a wage increase on their first jobs. However, it is somewhat ambiguous whether this is more relevant to the wage rate factor or to the steadiness of employment. The pay increase may reflect the fact that trainees in the higher quartiles were in better jobs that not only began at higher rates but that offered greater opportunities for wage increases. On the other hand, these figures also reflect the fact that people in the higher quartiles remained on their jobs for a longer period of time, since pay increases often come automatically after a certain amount of time spent on a job.

TABLE 21

Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Trainees' Reports of Post-Program Job History*

	Males				Females			
	I Lowest Earnings (N = 46)	II (N = 29)	III (N = 38)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 42)	I Lowest Earnings (N = 35)	II (N = 79)	III (N = 32)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 32)
Number of full-time jobs after leaving program								
None	22%	0%	0%	0%	62%	0%	0%	0%
One	39	34	57	62	35	63	68	81
Two	22	50	24	31	3	26	23	19
Three or more	17	16	19	7	0	11	9	0
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Starting pay on first job after leaving program								
$1.25 or less	46%	47%	15%	5%	65%	48%	29%	3%
$1.26 to $1.50	19	23	40	17	14	35	43	51
$1.51 to $1.75	15	18	33	3	7	7	19	40
$1.76 to $2.00	17	6	6	24	7	7	6	0
Over $2.00	3	6	6	51	7	3	3	6
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Mean	$1.45	$1.38	$1.57	$1.98	$1.39	$1.38	$1.43	$1.55
Proportion getting pay increase on first job	31%	44%	74%	62%	7%	34%	61%	78%
Starting pay on second job after leaving program Mean	$1.53	$1.60	$1.61	$2.11	-	$1.16	$1.28	$1.56
	(N = 19)	(N = 24)	(N = 17)	(N = 20)	(N = 3)	(N = 10)	(N = 11)	(N = 8)

TABLE 21 (Cont)

Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Trainees' Reports of Post-Program Job History

	Males				Females			
	I Lowest Earnings (N = 46)	II (N = 29)	III (N = 38)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 42)	I Lowest Earnings (N = 35)	II (N = 79)	III (N = 32)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 32)
Number of months spent on first job after leaving program								
One month or less	38%	21%	11%	10%	67%	17%	0%	3%
One to three months	27	32	5	7	0	28	7	6
Three to six months	22	13	19	22	20	28	29	13
More than six months (no longer on job at time of interview)	5	5	3	12	0	6	16	6
More than six months (still on job at time of interview)	8	29	62	49	13	21	48	72
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Proportion of time worked in six-month period following end of program								
Lowest third (Men - Less than 50%) (Women - Less than 30%)	89%	8%	0%	0%	97%	17%	0%	0%
Middle third (Men - 50% - 95%) (Women - 30% - 90%)	11	62	29	19	0	76	59	13
Highest third (Men - 95% or more) (Women - 90% or more)	0	30	71	81	3	7	41	87
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*Significance tests were not computed for this table since the earnings index was derived on the basis of the responses to the questions presented in the table.

marked when we look at the average wage rates within each earnings quartile. They are very clear, however, when we look at the total wage distribution. What is particularly striking is the large proportion of trainees in the lower quartiles who started on the lowest paying jobs of $1.25 an hour or less. Among the men, 46 percent and 47 percent of the trainees in the two lowest quartiles started on such jobs contrasted to 15 percent and 5 percent in the two highest quartiles. Among the women there is a steady progression as one goes from the lowest to the highest quartile, with 65 percent, 48 percent, 29 percent and 3 percent of the trainees in the four quartiles having started at a rate of $1.25 or less.

To the extent, then, that wage rate is a reflection of the quality of a job, the trainees who earned more in the post-program period were those who were able to get somewhat better jobs. It is also clear, however, that their greater total earnings were perhaps even more related to the fact that they stayed on these jobs longer. Whereas, only 13 percent of the men in the lowest quartile remained on their first job for more than six months, this was true for 34 percent of those in the second, 65 percent of the third and 61 percent of the men trainees in the highest earnings quartiles. For the women trainees, the figures are 13 percent, 27 percent, 64 percent and 78 percent as we go from the lowest to the highest quartiles. And this greater tendency to remain on the first job is reflected in the figures on the total employment history in the six-month baseline period. In Table 21, the proportion of time worked during that period has been divided into thirds, to point up the differences among the earnings quartiles. The differences are striking. Among the men, where the highest third represents trainees who worked 95 percent or more of the time in that six-month period, we find that whereas none of the trainees in the lowest earnings quartile worked 95 percent or more of the time, this was true of 81 percent of the trainees in the highest quartile. Among the women trainees, where the highest third represents trainees who worked 90 percent or more of the time, we find this was true for 3 percent, 7 percent, 41 percent and 87 percent of the women trainees as we go from the lowest to the highest earnings quartiles.

It appears, then, that both factors - the wage rate and the steadiness of employment - are important contributors to the earnings index. These two factors, it should be noted, are not independent. The lower paid jobs are more often temporary in nature. Even if not temporary, the fact that they are less desirable makes people more ready to leave them. However, the very factors that keep a person from getting a better paid job in the first place operate to keep him from moving to an appreciably better job, setting up a continuing cycle of low wage rates and sporadic employment.

Job-Seeking Behavior

Since steadiness of employment is so critical in the determination of total earnings, a trainee's job-seeking activity is particularly important. In addition to obtaining from the trainee a detailed history of the jobs he did have in the period following the JOBS Project, the interview also asked him about any jobs he might have been offered but turned down for various reasons, as well as any jobs he applied for and wanted but did not get. The relationship between the trainee's responses to these two questions and his post-program earnings is presented in Table 22.

TABLE 22

Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Post-Program Job Seeking

	Males				Females			
	I Lowest Earnings (N = 46)	II (N = 39)	III (N = 38)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 42)	I Lowest Earnings (N = 35)	II (N = 29)	III (N = 32)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 32)
Did trainee turn down any jobs?								
Yes	11%	8%	8%	17%	12%	10%	28%	6%
No	89	92	92	83	88	90	72	94
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Chi^2 = 1.4661, df = 3 p = NS				Chi^2 = 4.559, df = 3 p = NS			
Did trainee apply for jobs that he did not get?								
Yes, more than one	28%	28%	8%	9%	38%	38%	13%	6%
Yes, one	36	31	16	12	21	31	16	13
No, none	36	41	76	79	41	31	61	81
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Chi^2 = 28.207, df = 6 p = .001				Chi^2 = 22.940, df = 6 p = .001			

Of particular interest in this table are the figures for the trainees in the lowest two earnings quartiles. Since the great majority of those in the two highest quartiles spent more than six months on the first job they went to after the program, we would not expect them to have spent much time actively looking for jobs in the job market; and, we see in Table 22 that most of them neither turned down any jobs nor applied for jobs they did not receive in that period. Among the lowest two quartiles, however, which consist of those trainees who were unemployed a considerable proportion of the time, the data in Table 22 are particularly crucial.

There are several findings of interest for the two lowest quartiles in Table 22. One set of findings points up the unfavorable market position of these trainees. A much larger proportion of the low-earning trainees were turned down for jobs they sought than found themselves in the much more enviable position of turning down jobs they were offered but felt were not good enough. For example, among the men trainees in the lowest job earnings quartile, 64 percent reported applying for a job they did not get, contrasted to only 11 percent who reported turning down any job. And comparable figures obtained for the men trainees in the second lowest quartile, and for the women trainees in the two lowest quartiles.

Another finding of interest in this table is that the figures suggest that the trainees were not particularly active in seeking jobs. One should be cautious in interpreting these figures since they refer to jobs that the trainee at the time of the interview could still recall having applied for many months ago. Thus, they probably include only jobs that were particularly salient and that the trainee was most actively engaged in looking over and not jobs that he might have casually inquired about. Even with this caution, however, the figures do seem to suggest a certain degree of apathy in the job-seeking process. It is noteworthy, for example, that in the two lowest quartiles of the male and female trainees, from 31 percent to 41 percent of the trainees reported that they had not applied for any job at all in addition to the ones that they did obtain during that period, despite the fact that they were unemployed a considerable proportion of this time. To a certain extent this suggests some degree of "opting out" on the part of the trainees in the face of the discouragement of the job market that obtained for them. Given a situation in which they seemed to be eligible for only the lowest paid temporary jobs, where movement to a new job meant little or no improvement, and where the attempts they did make for the better jobs were met with rejection, it is not surprising that many of the trainees became apathetic and discouraged.

Dropout, Graduation and Placement as Criteria of Success

Relationship to the Earnings Criterion

Our second success criterion, it will be recalled, involves a distinction among three groups of trainees: those who dropped out before graduation, those who graduated and were placed in a job upon graduation, and finally, those who graduated and either were placed at a later date or never placed on a job at all. The first question of interest to explore with respect to this criterion is its relation to the other criterion of post-program earnings. The relationship between these two is presented in Table 23.

The importance of distinguishing the two types of program graduates is apparent from the figures in Table 23. The program graduates who were placed

TABLE 23

Relationship Between Dropout-Placement and Post-Program Earnings

	Males I Dropouts (N = 47)	Males II Late or Nonplaced Graduates (N = 36)	Males III Early Placed Graduates (N = 100)
Average weekly earnings for six-month period following end of program			
Lowest quartile post-program earnings ($0 to $32)	46%	44%	13%
Second quartile ($33 to $55)	13	28	27
Third quartile ($56 to $74)	23	9	28
Highest quartile ($75 and over)	18	19	32
	100%	100%	100%

I vs. II, Chi^2 = 4.911, 3 df, p = NS
II vs. III, Chi^2 = 16.470, 3 df, p = .001
I vs. III, Chi^2 = 22.420, 3 df, p = .001

	Females I Dropouts (N = 63)	Females II Late or Nonplaced Graduates (N = 29)	Females III Early Placed Graduates (N = 59)
Average weekly earnings for six-month period following end of program			
Lowest quartile post-program earnings ($0 to $9)	49%	32%	5%
Second quartile ($10 to $37)	19	18	28
Third quartile ($38 to $55)	17	36	28
Highest quartile ($56 and over)	15	14	39
	100%	100%	100%

I vs. II, Chi^2 = 3.752, 3 df, p = NS
II vs. III, Chi^2 = 14.557, 3 df, p = .01
I vs. III, Chi^2 = 28.809, 3 df, p = .001

upon graduation did considerably better with respect to their earnings after leaving the program than did either the trainees who dropped out of the program or those who graduated without being immediately placed. This difference was true for both the men and women trainees.

It is apparent from the figures in Table 23 that the mere fact of remaining in a program until graduation is not necessarily a positive sign. The "less successful" graduates - those who were not immediately placed upon graduation - did not do significantly better in the job world than did those trainees who dropped out of the program. If we compare the dropouts with the trainees not immediately placed, we see that the latter did somewhat better among the female trainees, whereas the dropouts did somewhat better among the male trainees. However, in neither case was the difference significant. The crucial finding is that both of these groups did considerably less well than did the graduates who were placed upon graduation.

The fact that the graduates who were placed did so much better than the dropouts should be underscored. Many of the people who drop out of these manpower programs do so in order to take a job that has become available to them. It is particularly crucial in these programs, therefore, to obtain data relevant to the question of whether a trainee has anything to gain by foregoing an available job and staying with a program to the end. This difference between the dropouts and placed graduates depicted in Table 23 is a particularly significant one, therefore. We will attempt to explore some of its meaning and implications when we discuss other findings related to dropout and placement in the section below and the chapters that follow.

Relative Importance of Wage Rate and Regularity of Employment

Since graduating and getting placed on a job is related to a trainee's total post-program earnings, it is of interest to explore the question we asked with respect to the earnings index itself, namely, the extent to which the greater earnings of the placed graduates is a function of each of the two factors that go into the earnings index - the wage rate of the jobs acquired and the steadiness of the employment on these jobs. Table 24, therefore, compares the dropouts and two categories of program graduates on a number of characteristics of the post-program job history that are relevant to the issues of wage rates and steadiness of employment.

An interesting pattern of results appears in the table. The greater earnings of the placed graduates was much more related to the steadiness of their employment than to the wage rates of the jobs they were able to obtain in the post-program period. Although the starting pay of the first jobs they went to after the end of the program averaged a little higher for the placed graduates than for the other graduates and the dropouts, the differences were small and not significant. Moreover, there was even less difference if we look at the average wage rates of the trainees' second post-program jobs. The greater earnings of the placed graduates, therefore, were almost exclusively a function of the other factor in the earnings index, namely, the steadiness of the employment.

Several findings presented in Table 24 illustrate this. The placed graduates were employed a much larger proportion of time in the six months baseline period following the end of the program. This was largely a reflection of their longer tenure on the first job they went to after the program. Among

TABLE 24

Relation of Dropout-Placement to Trainees' Reports of Post-Program Job History

		Males			Females		
		I Dropouts (N = 47)	II Late or Nonplaced Graduates (N = 36)	III Early Placed Graduates (N = 100)	I Dropouts (N = 63)	II Late or Nonplaced Graduates (N = 29)	III Early Placed Graduates (N = 59)
Number of full-time jobs after leaving program	None	11%	8%	3%*	41%	28%	2%*
	One	30	44	56	42	52	73
	Two	42	31	29	10	17	21
	Three or more	17	17	12	7	3	4
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		I vs. III, Chi^2 = 8.778, 2 df** p = .05. All others NS.			I vs. III, Chi^2 = 31.393, 2 df** p = .001. All others NS.		
Starting pay on first job after leaving program	$1.25 or less	33%	39%	21%	38%	45%	25%
	$1.26 to $1.50	30	19	27	31	50	39
	$1.51 to $1.75	12	13	21	18	0	25
	$1.76 to $2.00	7	19	14	5	0	7
	Over $2.00	18	10	17	8	5	4
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	$1.60	$1.54	$1.61	$1.48	$1.30	$1.46
			All NS		II vs. III, Chi^2 = 11.146, 3 df** p = .01. All others NS.		
Proportion getting pay increase on first job		34%	31%	60%	39%	41%	63%
		I vs. III, II vs. III, p = .01 I vs. II NS (difference between proportions)				All NS	
Starting pay on second job after leaving program	Mean	$1.71	$1.77	$1.73	$1.34	$1.52	$1.25
		(N = 31)	(N = 15)	(N = 45)	(N = 11)	(N = 7)	(N = 19)

TABLE 24 (Cont)

	I Dropouts (N = 47)	II Late or Nonplaced Graduates (N = 36)	III Early Placed Graduates (N = 100)	I Dropouts (N = 63)	II Late or Nonplaced Graduates (N = 29)	III Early Placed Graduates (N = 59)
Number of months spent on first job after leaving program						
One month or less	32%	26%	17%	25%	14%	9%
One to three months	20	27	15	25	10	7
Three to six months	24	18	18	15	38	21
More than six months (no longer on job at time of interview)	7	3	6	7	5	12
More than six months (still on job at time of interview)	17	26	44	28	33	51
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	I vs. III, Chi^2 = 10.267, 3 df** p = .05; all others NS			I vs II, Chi^2 = 9.240, 3 df**, p = .05 I vs III, Chi^2 = 18.142, 3 df**, p = .001		
Proportion of time worked in six-month period following end of program						
Lowest third (Men - less than 50%) (Women - less than 30%)	43%	44%	12%	51%	41%	9
Middle third (Men - 50% to 95%) (Women - 30% to 90%)	36	34	25	29	18	47
Highest third (Men - 95% or more) (Women - 90% or more)	21	22	63	20	41	44
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	II vs III, Chi^2 = 24.672, 2 df, p = .001 I vs III, Chi^2 - 27.056, 2 df, p = .001 I vs II NS			II vs III, Chi^2 = 14.299, 2 df, p = .001 I vs III, Chi^2 = 26.449, 2 df, p = .001 I vs II NS		

*In these few instances where trainees categorized as "early placements" report having had no jobs, there is a discrepancy between the project records and trainees' reports. It is possible that these represent instances where a trainee was placed but remained on the job a very short period of time.

**Two highest categories combined.

the men trainees, for example, 50 percent of the early placed graduates remained on their first post-program job for more than six months, contrasted to 29 percent of the other graduates and 24 percent of the dropouts. Among the women trainees the comparable figures were 67 percent in contrast to 38 percent and 35 percent.

In summary, then, although our two criteria of success were related to each other, the characteristics making up the success differed for the two criteria. In the earnings criterion, the more successful trainees both obtained more highly paid jobs and remained on them longer. In the dropout, graduation and placement criterion, the greater success was a function of only one of these factors, the steadiness of employment. It is by staying with the job longer, not by working on more highly paid jobs, that the graduates who were placed by the project achieved their greater overall earnings in the post-program period. In contrast to the trainees in the higher quartiles of post-program earnings, those who graduated from the program and were placed by the project did not appear to be people who could command the better jobs in the job market available to these trainees.[5] Rather, their higher total earnings seem to have been a function of the same "staying with it" characteristics that were relevant for their remaining in the program until the end. This distinction should be kept in mind in the following chapters where we will relate both the earnings criterion and the dropout-placement criterion to a number of other variables; for it is a distinction which will help clarify why factors related to one of these criteria are at times not related to the other.

One other comment is perhaps appropriate at this time. We may raise the question of the meaningfulness of dropout-placement as a "success" criterion in a situation where the dropouts seem to have obtained jobs almost as good as those of the trainees who stayed in the program until the end and were placed in a job upon graduation. In this connection it should be noted that this minimal difference between the wage rates of dropouts and early placed graduates is probably related to some of the problems in JOBS-I that were discussed in the preceding chapter. Particularly relevant are the problems the project experienced in providing meaningful skill training and in placing trainees on jobs that utilized the training. We would expect larger differences in the wage rates of the jobs obtained by dropouts and placed graduates from projects where the skill training was more successfully carried through and implemented. Thus, although dropout-placement may be limited as a success criterion in JOBS-I, it may still be a significant criterion for programs generally, making the investigation of the factors related to dropout and placement a significant endeavor.

---

[5] It is possible that the jobs of the graduates who were placed were "better" than those of the other two groups of trainees, even though they did not have an appreciably higher beginning rate of pay. For example, they may have provided more opportunities for advancement. There is no evidence for this, however. It is true that the findings in Table 24 indicate that a larger proportion of the early placed graduates received a pay increase on their first job. However, since pay increases tend to come automatically after a certain amount of time on the job, this greater proportion of pay increases may merely reflect the fact that the placed graduates tended to remain on their jobs longer. These pay increases do not necessarily reflect the quality of the job. In general, the wage rate may be taken as a fairly good indicator of the quality of a job and the opportunities it affords.

Other Success Indices

Before turning, in the following chapters, to the factors related to earnings and dropout-placement, it may be of interest to examine the relationships of these two indices to other measures that might be viewed as criteria of success. In this section we will look at two such criteria: the tendency of the trainee to seek further education and training; and the evaluation of the trainee by people in a position to judge the trainee's performance, in this instance the project staff and the job supervisors.

Trainees' Interest in Further Training and Education

One possible criterion of success that has been proposed by people involved in manpower programs, particularly those devoted to young school dropouts, is the extent to which programs such as these develop an interest in further schooling. Given the increasing complexity of the job world that the trainees will face, any real possibility for long-term occupational mobility depends upon the trainees' going on to further schooling and training.

Tables 25 and 26 present the relation of the earnings and dropout-placement criteria to the trainees' post-program behavior with respect to further schooling and training. These tables include data on whether the trainee actually got some further training or education in that period and also whether he sought such training even if he was not able to get any.

The data in Tables 25 and 26 suggest that there was some relationship between the two success criteria and the extent to which the trainees sought or obtained some schooling after leaving the program. There was some tendency for the trainees with the highest earnings, as well as those who graduated and were placed by the program, to more often seek some additional schooling. It might also be noted that the one group that was highest in the category "did not seek any schooling" consists of the male trainees who stayed in the program to the end but were either never placed by the project or placed at some point after graduation. The experience of staying to the end and not having a job waiting for them may have been particularly disappointing and disillusioning and made this group particularly skeptical about the value of further schooling or training.

It should be noted that the relationships depicted in Tables 25 and 26 are small and not significant. However, given the fact that the post-program period encompassed in the study was less than a year and that most of the trainees in the placed and higher earnings categories were employed full time in that period, it is possible that the tendency for these trainees to seek more schooling would have been more striking if we could have followed them through a longer period of time.

One other comment on these tables is relevant. Further training has sometimes been viewed as an alternative to earnings as a criterion of success. It has sometimes been argued that post-program earnings are not an adequate criterion because many trainees choose to go for further schooling rather than into the job market. The data in this study suggest that this is not true; if anything, further training is more often sought by those people who are also working.

TABLE 25

Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Post-Program Schooling

	Males				Females			
	I Lowest Earnings (N = 46)	II (N = 39)	III (N = 38)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 42)	I Lowest Earnings (N = 35)	II (N = 29)	III (N = 32)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 32)
Got some schooling or training since leaving program	11%	18%	17%	17%	12%	7%	13%	19%
Tried to get into some school or training program since leaving program	11	13	5	12	6	24	19	16
Did not seek any schooling	78 100%	69 100%	78 100%	71 100%	82 100%	69 100%	68 100%	65 100%

Males: $Chi^2 = 3.835$, df = 6, p = NS

Females: $Chi^2 = 5.505$, df = 6, p = NS

TABLE 26

Relation of Dropout-Placement to Post-Program Schooling

	Males			Females		
	I Dropouts (N = 47)	II Late or Nonplaced Graduates (N = 36)	III Early Placed Graduates (N = 100)	I Dropouts (N = 63)	II Late or Nonplaced Graduates (N = 29)	III Early Placed Graduates (N = 59)
Got some schooling or training since leaving program	13%	11%	22%	11%	17%	19%
Tried to get into some school or training program since leaving program	13	3	11	14	10	19
Did not seek any schooling	74 100%	86 100%	67 100%	75 100%	73 100%	62 100%

Males: $Chi^2 = 5.089$, df = 4, p = NS

Females: $Chi^2 = 3.034$, df = 4, p = NS

Evaluations by Project Staff

We have attempted in our choice of dropout-placement and job earnings as the two major criteria, to choose "hard" criteria based on clear and significant behavioral data. There are many intangibles operating in programs such as the JOBS Project, however - many subtle and intangible effects that the program is attempting to accomplish, particularly in the area of trainee attitudes, motivation and morale. These intangibles are hard to capture and measure, but we can approach them to some extent through the evaluations of people in a position to judge the trainees. Two sets of evaluations were obtained in this study. The trainees were evaluated both by the project staff members and by the supervisors of the first job they went to after the termination of the program. The staff ratings were obtained in June of 1964, a month or two before the official termination of the JOBS Project. The supervisory ratings were obtained in the summer of 1965 during the course of the supervisor interview.

Tables 27 and 28 present the relationship between our two success criteria and the staff members' evaluations of the trainees. In June of 1964, toward the end of the program, each staff member was given a questionnaire that included a list of the trainees from our interview sample. The staff members were asked to indicate which of these trainees they had had "quite a bit of contact" with; they then rated these trainees on a three-point scale according to whether they felt they were in the "top third," "middle third," or "bottom third" of "all the trainees in this unit on ability." Each trainee in our interview sample was then given a score based on the average of the ratings given him by the staff members.

The findings in Table 27 demonstrate the relationship that was anticipated. Trainees who were rated more highly in ability by the staff people toward the end of the program tended to emerge with higher earnings in the period following the program's end.[6] But the relationship was not as striking as one might expect. It is even less striking when we look at the dropout-placement criterion in Table 28, where we might have expected a much larger relationship since the staff's rating of a trainee toward the end of a program should be highly related to whether or not the program places him upon graduation. We do see such a relationship among the male trainees where the placed graduates were rated more highly by the staff than either the dropouts or the nonplaced graduates. But again the difference is not as striking as one might expect. And among the women trainees, the difference between placed graduates and dropouts was not statistically significant and there was no difference at all between the two different categories of graduates. This latter finding is particularly interesting and underscores a difference between the male and female less successful graduates that we have already noted and that will appear again in future findings. Among the men trainees, it was the late or nonplaced graduates that represented a particularly unfortunate grouping while the dropouts were often much more comparable to the placed graduates; among the women trainees, on the other hand, it was the dropouts who usually stood out most negatively on various dimensions.

---

[6] It will be noted in Table 27 that statistical significance was tested by computing t-tests for all possible comparisons between two quartiles, rather than by one F-test to indicate the significance of the overall relationship between staff ratings and later earnings. This same procedure was observed in all the tables which follow where the earnings index is related to means on other variables. The reason for this was to point up those instances where relationships with earnings were not continuous but largely a function of extremely low or high earnings.

TABLE 27

Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Evaluations of Trainees by Program Staff

	Males				Females			
	I Lowest Earnings (N = 39)	II (N = 20)	III (N = 14)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 21)	I Lowest Earnings (N = 31)	I (N = 14)	III (N = 21)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 14)
Average Ability Rating of Trainees by Program Staff at End of Program (three-point scale with 1 representing highest rating)	2.19	2.06	1.79	1.88	2.14	1.70	1.67	1.62
		I vs III,** IV**				I vs II,** III,* IV**		

TABLE 28

Relation of Dropout-Placement to Evaluations of Trainees by Program Staff

	Males			Females		
	I Dropouts (N = 44)	II Late or Nonplaced Graduates (N = 35)	III Early Placed Graduates (N = 30)	I Dropouts (N = 59)	II Late or Nonplaced Graduates (N = 28)	III Early Placed Graduates (N = 13)
Average Ability Rating of Trainees by Program Staff at End of Program (three-point scale with 1 representing highest rating)	2.03	2.17	1.82	1.93	1.71	1.75
	I vs III,*** II vs III*				I vs II***	

Significance levels: * .01
** .05
*** .10
All comparisons not indicated in the table were not significant.

It is perhaps not surprising that the relationship between staff ratings and later earnings was not more striking than appears in Table 27. The population being judged was a relatively homogeneous one and the variations in success were also fairly narrow in range. Moreover, since the staff members were asked to rate the trainees who were in our interview sample during the course of the project, and not the larger sample we contacted in the final interview, it will be noted that the ratings in Table 27 are based on a rather small number of cases. Even granted these considerations, however, the fact that the relationship, though significant, is not larger than it is, does indicate that success within the project, while related to later job success, is not a very certain predictor of it.

This underscores a fact that has become increasingly apparent to people running programs such as these, namely, that the relatively secure environment of the classroom and the project is very different from the work environment the trainee later encounters, that the two environments represent different challenges and make different demands. The fact that people who are judged more highly when they are in the project can fail when they enter the job world underscores the need for projects such as these to maximize the integration of the project and the job world, both in the training during the course of the project and in follow-up work with the trainees after the training ends. Projects today tend to be much more concerned with this issue than they were several years ago at the time JOBS-I was undertaken.

Evaluations by Job Supervisors

Some of these limitations of the staff members' evaluations as predictors of how well the trainee will do in the job world should not apply when we look at the evaluations of the supervisors of the trainees on their actual jobs. However, there are other problems in the use of supervisor evaluations. The major problem is that supervisors are not comparing the trainees with each other. The comparisons are between a trainee and the other people in the supervisor's work force. Since the trainees with higher earnings tend to be in better jobs, they are probably being judged against more demanding criteria. This should make the differences in the supervisors' evaluations smaller than they would have been if the trainees were being compared with each other. These considerations should be kept in mind in interpreting the findings discussed below.

The relationship between the supervisors' evaluations and the post-program earnings index are presented in Table 29. This table presents the relationship between earnings and several types of supervisory evaluations. In addition to obtaining the supervisor's rating of the trainees on a set of ability and motivational scales, we looked at more objective and concrete evidences of the supervisors' evaluations. More significant than how a supervisor feels about a trainee and how he rates him on a set of rating scales are the evidences of this evaluation in what actually happens to the trainee on the job. Therefore, Table 29 presents the relationship of the post-program earnings index to two concrete examples of the supervisors' and companies' evaluations, namely, whether or not the trainee was promoted on this first job and whether or not he was fired or laid off.[7]

---

[7] We have included layoff with firing even though technically it does not reflect on a trainee's job performance to the extent that his being fired does. However, as we suggested in our discussion of Table 20 above, it is likely that layoff is often used as an excuse for discharging people that the company feels are not performing adequately.

The relationships depicted in Table 29 do not show any clear, consistent pattern. In a number of cases there is a clear relationship between a more positive evaluation by the supervisor and company and greater job earnings on the part of the trainee. But this does not hold uniformly on every item of evaluation.

If we turn first to the "hard" and objective evidences of evaluation, we see a relationship between job earnings and the rewards and punishments the trainee received on the first job - whether he was promoted and whether he was discharged. A larger proportion of the trainees in the higher earnings quartiles received a promotion; a larger proportion of those in the lower quartiles were discharged. These relationships, it should be noted, were clearer and more significant for the women than for the men, largely because the men trainees in the highest success quartile had less promotions and more discharges than would have been expected from the figures in the other three quartiles. It will be recalled that the highest success quartile among the men was dramatically different from all other quartiles in the wage rate of the job, a reflection of the higher quality and qualifications demanded by the job. The fact that as large a proportion of the highest quartile men trainees were separated from their job, as was true of the trainees in the lower quartiles, does not necessarily indicate that the trainees in the different quartiles were of comparable adequacy or job performance. Rather, it probably reflects the fact that the trainees in the highest quartile were being judged in a job of more stringent standards.

In addition to the evaluations reflected in the objective criteria of promotion and job separation, the supervisors in the course of the interview were asked for a series of subjective evaluations. They were asked to rate the trainees on a series of five-point scales covering a number of areas: their overall performance, their skills, their motivations and attitudes. The supervisors were asked to compare the trainees with the usual person they had supervised in that type of job, with one on the scale representing a rating that the trainee was "among the best," three being a rating of "about average," and five representing a rating of "among the worst." Table 29 presents the average ratings on these different items for the trainees in the four earnings quartiles.

An interesting pattern of results emerges if we divide the items on which the trainees were rated into a category of "skill or ability" and a category reflecting the trainees' "attitudes and motivations." Among the men trainees there is no clear relationship between a supervisor's evaluation of the trainee's skills and his earnings quartile position. The relationship is an uneven one, with the trainees in both the second and the fourth quartiles being rated as having higher skills than those in the third. The relationships between earnings and the supervisor's evaluations of the trainee's motivations and attitudes, however, tend to be much more linear. The relationships are particularly striking with respect to the following items: "initiative," "desire to improve," "politeness," "ability to work with others." On all of these dimensions there was a clear tendency for the men trainees in the higher earnings quartiles to be rated more positively by their supervisors. In short, if we look at the supervisors' evaluations, earnings were more clearly related to a positive evaluation of trainees' attitudes and motivations than to the evaluation of their skills or ability.

This same distinction appears when we look at the figures for the women trainees in Table 29. The supervisor's ratings of the trainees' skills did not differ significantly for the women trainees in the different earnings quartiles,

TABLE 29

Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Evaluations of Trainees by Supervisors of First Post-Program Job

		Males				Females			
		I Lowest Earnings (N = 15)	II (N = 24)	III (N = 25)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 23)	I Lowest Earnings (N = 7)#	II (N = 14)	III (N = 20)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 22)
Proportion of trainees promoted from first job		7%	13%	29%	24%	-	0%	10%	36%
			All NS				IV vs II*; III**		
Proportion of trainees discharged from first job	Fired	27%	25%	16%	16%	-	47%	20%	9%
	Laid off	13	4	4	12	-	13	20	5
	Total discharged	40%	29%	20%	28%	-	60%	40%	14%
			All NS				IV vs II*; III**		
Supervisors' Evaluations of Trainees Means on five-point scales with 1 representing "among the best" to 5 representing "among the worst"	Overall rating on how well trainee does job	2.85	2.91	3.08	2.39	-	3.43	3.05	2.81
			IV vs II***, III**				II vs IV**		
	Trainee's skills	3.17	2.68	3.24	2.81	-	3.38	2.89	2.90
			II vs III**; III vs IV**				All NS		
	Trainee's initiative	3.27	3.36	3.00	2.62	-	3.62	3.26	2.79
			II vs IV**				II vs IV**		
	Trainee's attendance	2.75	2.68	2.56	2.55	-	3.29	2.42	2.52
			All NS				All NS		
	Trainee's promptness	2.67	2.50	2.33	2.27	-	3.23	2.53	2.57
			All NS				All NS		
	Trainee's responsibility	2.54	2.62	2.72	2.35	-	3.50	2.89	2.76
			All NS				II vs III**, IV*		
	Trainee's effort - hard work	2.85	2.73	2.84	2.43	-	3.14	2.95	2.85
			All NS				All NS		

TABLE 29 (Cont)

	Males				Females			
	I Lowest Earnings (N = 15)	II (N = 24)	III (N = 25)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 23)	I Lowest Earnings (N = 7)	II (N = 14)	III (N = 20)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 22)
Supervisors' Evaluations of Trainees (Cont)								
Trainee's desire to improve	2.82	2.80	2.54	2.10	-	3.29	2.69	2.65
		II vs IV**				All NS		
Trainee's politeness	2.33	2.09	2.16	1.61	-	2.50	2.05	2.19
		IV vs I,** II,** III**				All NS		
Trainee's ability to work with others	2.69	2.50	2.28	2.14	-	2.71	2.26	2.38
		I vs IV***				All NS		
Trainee's quickness to learn	2.83	3.10	3.00	2.60	-	3.57	2.58	2.86
		All NS				II vs III,* IV**		
Trainee's education level	2.82	3.28	3.00	2.78	-	3.30	3.00	3.06
		II vs IV***				All NS		
Trainee's honesty	2.45	2.42	2.29	2.30	-	2.91	2.21	2.38
		All NS				II vs III,** IV**		

Significance levels:
* .01
** .05
*** .10
NS Not significant
All comparisons not indicated in the table were not significant.

#Statistics not computed because of small N.

whereas a number of significant differences appeared when we looked at the ratings of trainee attitudes and motivations. Although this distinction was somewhat less striking than was true for the men trainees, the same tendency appeared.

It should once again be underscored that the supervisors were comparing the trainees with other people they had supervised and were not comparing these trainees with each other. Therefore, the fact that there was no clear relationship between earnings and the supervisor's evaluation of the trainee's skill does not mean that the trainees with higher earnings were not more skilled than those with lower earnings. As we have already indicated, the trainees in the higher quartiles, particularly the men in the highest quartile, were in somewhat more skilled and demanding jobs and were therefore probably being compared by their supervisors with workers that were more qualified than were the workers that served as the comparison for the trainees in the lower earnings quartiles.

On the other hand, this was also true for the supervisors' attitudinal and motivational ratings. The fact that the trainees in the higher earnings quartiles were compared with workers that were "better" than those being compared to the lower earnings trainees, should also serve to minimize differences among the quartiles in the attitudinal and motivational ratings. It is, therefore, significant that clear differences did appear in the motivational area. We have already seen, in the preceding findings discussed in this chapter, evidences of the more frustrating situation of the trainees in the lower earnings quartiles and some behavioral indications of this in their more sporadic employment and apathy in the job market. We would expect these behaviors to be accompanied by the kinds of attitudes the supervisors were asked to rate. In this sense, then, we may see the attitudinal differences among the trainees in the different earnings quartiles as reflecting the situational and behavioral differences already discussed in this chapter.

To point to a probable relationship between trainee attitudes and trainee earnings does not, of course, suggest the meaning of the relationship. We will return to this question in much greater detail in Chapter V, which is devoted to the issue of trainee attitudes and motivations. For the purposes of the present discussion we wish merely to note that in some sense the supervisory ratings are congruent with the picture of the different earnings quartiles that has emerged from the other data discussed in this chapter.

When we turn in Table 30 to the dropout-placement criterion, we see less relationship with supervisors' evaluations than was true when we looked at the earnings criterion. Looking first at the objective criteria of promotions and separations from the first post-program job, we find no consistent, significant differences among the dropouts and the two categories of program graduates. There was no clear relationship between whether a person was a dropout, an early-placed graduate, or a graduate who was placed late or not at all, and whether or not the trainee was promoted on the first job he went to after the training program. Nor was there any clear tendency for the trainees who were placed by the program upon graduation to have fared better in the sense of less often being fired or laid off from this job than was true of the dropouts or other graduates. If anything, we might note a tendency for a larger proportion of the placed graduates to have been fired from their first job than was true of the dropouts, at least among the male trainees. This may reflect the fact that the dropout's first job was a job he had obtained himself. Therefore, the company may have exercised more selection before hiring the dropout than was true for

TABLE 30

Relation of Dropout-Placement to Evaluations of Trainees by Supervisors of First Post-Program Job

	Males			Females		
	I Dropouts (N = 17)	II Late or Nonplaced Graduates (N = 14)	III Early Placed Graduates (N = 62)	I Dropouts (N = 18)	II Late or Nonplaced Graduates (N = 12)	III Early Placed Graduates (N = 42)
Proportion of trainees promoted from first job	12%	14% All NS	19%	22%	8% All NS	17%
Proportion of trainees discharged from first job — Fired	6%	36%	26%	11%	17%	26%
Laid off	12	0	10	28	33	7
Total discharged	18%	36% All NS	36%	39%	50% All NS	33%
Supervisors' Evaluations of Trainees Means on five-point scales with 1 representing "among the best" to 5 representing "among the worst"						
Overall rating on how well trainee does job	2.73	3.00 All NS	2.83	2.87	2.75 All NS	3.07
Trainee's skills	2.93	2.77 All NS	3.00	3.00	2.64 All NS	3.00
Trainee's initiative	2.92	3.08 All NS	3.07	3.07	2.90 All NS	3.18
Trainee's attendance	2.60	3.00 All NS	2.61	2.79	2.36 All NS	2.71
Trainee's promptness	2.53	2.83 All NS	2.39	3.07	2.82 All NS	2.55
Trainee's responsibility	2.71	2.69 All NS	2.57	3.00	2.80 All NS	2.93

TABLE 30 (Cont)

Supervisors' Evaluations of Trainees (Cont)	Males I Dropouts (N = 17)	Males II Late or Nonplaced Graduates (N = 14)	Males III Early Placed Graduates (N = 62)	Females I Dropouts (N = 18)	Females II Late or Nonplaced Graduates (N = 12)	Females III Early Placed Graduates (N = 42)
Trainee's effort - hard work	2.73	3.00 All NS	2.67	3.00	2.80 All NS	2.85
Trainee's desire to improve	2.92	3.23 II vs I,*** II vs III*	2.33	2.73	2.56 All NS	2.92
Trainee's politeness	2.27	2.42 II vs III***	1.97	2.13	2.18 All NS	2.24
Trainee's ability to work with others	2.31	2.92 II vs I,** II vs III*	2.29	2.33	2.36 All NS	2.44
Trainee's quickness to learn	3.29	3.00 I vs III**	2.73	3.00	2.73 All NS	2.93
Trainee's education level	3.00	3.00 All NS	2.94	2.90	2.88 All NS	3.17
Trainee's honesty	2.31	2.75 All NS	2.33	2.46	2.45 All NS	2.41

Significance levels: * .01
** .05
*** .10
NS Not significant
All comparisons not indicated in the table were not significant.

the trainees whose first job represented a placement from the JOBS Project. In the latter case, there may have been more tendency to accept a trainee without some of the usual screening and to do the selection after the trainee had been on the job.

When we turn from these objective evaluation criteria to the supervisor's subjective ratings of the trainees, we again see less relationships than obtained when we looked at the earnings criterion in Table 29. Among the women trainees there is no relationship between supervisory ratings and whether the trainee was a dropout, a placed graduate or less successful graduate. Among the men trainees there are also minimal differences between the dropouts and the early-placed graduates. The other category of graduates, those who were placed at a later date or not at all, did emerge with lower ratings on several of the motivational and attitudinal items. For example, they were rated less positively than both the dropouts and the early-placed graduates on "desire to improve" and "ability to work with others" and less positively than the early-placed graduates on "politeness."[8] But these items did not distinguish the early-placed graduates from the dropouts, and it is this comparison which is of most interest to people concerned with evaluating the results of manpower training programs.

These minimal relationships with the dropout-placement criterion represent a finding that will recur in the following chapters. In general we will find that dropout-placement showed less relationship with other factors than did the earnings criterion. This is a reflection of the comment that was previously made in this chapter when it was noted that the dropouts and placed graduates did not differ significantly in the wage rates of their post-program jobs. At least in the JOBS-I Project, dropout-placement was not as clear an index of a trainee's success as were his earnings in the post-program job world.

In summary, then, we may say of the supervisors' evaluations, as we did of the staff evaluations, that they were not as highly related to the two success criteria as might have been expected. The earnings criterion was related to some of these evaluations (promotions on the job, ratings of the trainees' attitudes and motives, and for the women trainees,firings and layoffs from the job), but not significantly related to other evaluations (ratings of trainees' skills and, among the men trainees, the data on firings and layoffs). The dropout-placement criterion showed no relationships with any of the evaluations, except for a few findings that pointed up the special attitudinal morale problems of the men who graduated from the program but were not immediately placed on a job. Much of the reason for not obtaining more striking relationships is undoubtedly due to the fact that the supervisors were not comparing our more and less "successful" trainees with each other. But part of the reason also probably lies in the fact that the trainees in this study represented a relatively narrow range along a success criterion. Although there was some range in the wage rates and skill demands of the jobs trainees obtained, even in the best instances the jobs neither demanded not rewarded anything unusual with respect to skill.[9] Given the relative homogeneity of the group, it is perhaps more surprising that a number of clear differences did appear among the trainees of different post-program earnings, rather than that the differences were not more striking and consistent.

---

[8] These findings are consistent with those we have already noted and others we will be discussing that point up the particular morale problems in this group.

[9] One other finding from the supervisor interviews supports the notion that the jobs obtained by the trainees were not particularly demanding of skill. In

Supervisors' Reactions to JOBS Project

The discussion of the supervisors' evaluations of the trainees leads us to one final issue in our discussion of success criteria. In manpower programs generally, and in the special E and D programs particularly, the people responsible for these programs have been concerned not only with the trainees' success but with the impact of the program on the community. Particularly important is the response of the business community, for on its sympathy and interest depend, to a large extent, the opportunities that will be presented to graduates of such programs.

Because of this interest, we asked the supervisors not only to evaluate their trainees but to give their general opinions about the JOBS Project and their attitudes toward hiring more JOBS Project trainees. In Table 31 we look at the supervisors' responses to these questions separately for the trainees in the different earnings quartiles. Most of the supervisors we interviewed only had contact with one trainee from the JOBS Project, the one from our interview sample. Therefore, we expected to find some relationship between the trainee's score on the job earnings index and how positive his supervisor was toward the JOBS Project. Since we have already seen that trainees in the higher earnings quartiles tended to be evaluated somewhat more positively by their supervisors, we expected this to generalize to a somewhat more favorable attitude toward the JOBS Project as a whole. The findings in Table 31 suggest some tendency in this direction although the relationship is by no means a striking or continuous one. Similar slight but not consistent findings appear when we look at the relationship between the supervisory attitudes and the trainees' dropout-graduate status (Table 32).

Perhaps more important than the relationship between supervisory attitudes and the trainee's position on the two success criteria is the fact that for all categories of trainees the reactions of the supervisors to the JOBS Project tended to be a favorable one. Particularly crucial is the fact that the majority of the supervisors indicated a willingness to hire more JOBS Project trainees. This is consistent with the fact, if we turn back to Tables 29 and 30 and look at the average rankings given by the supervisors to their trainees, that the rankings tended to average around 2.7 to 2.8. On the five-point scales given to the supervisors this means that they tended to rate the trainees from the JOBS Project as average or even a little better than the average worker in their experience.

We have already commented on the fact that success in this population was relative and even in its highest instances did not represent any unusual attainment. Similarly, it might be noted that failure was also relative and not necessarily an unusual underachievement if we view these trainees in relation

---

all cases where the supervisors reported that the trainee had been fired, they were asked to give the reasons this had happened. In only a few instances did the supervisor indicate that the trainee had been unable to do the job. The great majority of the reasons referred to attitudinal and behavioral problems, as indicated, for example, in irregular attendance.

TABLE 31

Relation of Trainees' Post-Program Earnings to First Job Supervisors' Reactions to JOBS Project*

	Males				Females			
	I Lowest Earnings (N = 15)	II (N = 24)	III (N = 25)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 23)	I Lowest Earnings (N = 7)	II (N = 14)	III (N = 20)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 22)
Supervisors' Attitudes Toward JOBS Project								
Positive	39%	47%	29%	57%	-	29%	24%	38%
Pro-con or neutral	23	15	24	22	-	21	24	28
Negative	23	24	14	5	-	14	6	6
Never heard of project	15	14	33	16	-	36	46	28
	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%
	Chi^2 = 3.225, df = 3,** p = NS				Chi^2 = 2.386, df = 2,** p = NS			
Supervisors' Attitudes Toward Hiring More JOBS Project Trainees								
Probably would	58%	52%	45%	76%	-	54%	84%	75%
Depends	42	26	50	24	-	38	8	19
Probably would not	0	22	5	0	-	8	8	6
	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	100%	100%
	Chi^2 = 5.245, df = 3,*** p = NS				Chi^2 = 1.885, df = 2,*** p = NS			

*Following are the proportion of supervisors who had supervised other JOBS Project trainees in addition to the one from the interview sample. Among the supervisors of the male trainees, 34%, 43%, 23% and 34% in Quartiles I, II, III and IV, respectively; among the supervisors of the female trainees, 21%, 25% and 45% in Quartiles II, III and IV, respectively.

**In computing the Chi-square tests those who never heard of the project were eliminated and the "pro-con" and "negative" categories combined.

***"Depends" and "probably would not" categories combined.

TABLE 32

Relation of Dropout-Placement to First Job Supervisors' Reactions to JOBS Project*

	Males			Females		
	I Dropouts (N = 17)	II Late or Nonplaced Graduates (N = 14)	III Early Placed Graduates (N = 62)	I Dropouts (N = 18)	II Late or Nonplaced Graduates (N = 12)	III Early Placed Graduates (N = 42)
Supervisors' Attitudes Toward JOBS Project						
Positive	19%	33%	52%	14%	46%	35%
Pro-con or neutral	27	8	20	14	9	35
Negative	27	17	13	0	9	8
Never heard of project	27	42	15	72	36	22
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	I vs III, Chi^2 = 6.724, df = 1** p = .01; all others NS			All NS		
Supervisors' Attitudes Toward Hiring More JOBS Project Trainees						
Probably would	54%	59%	60%	78%	100%	65%
Depends	38	25	36	22	0	26
Probably would not	8	16	4	0	0	9
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	All NS			I vs II, Chi^2 = 4.650, 1 df,*** p = .05 II vs III, Chi^2 = 5.050, 1 df,*** p = .05 I vs III NS		

---

*Following are the proportions of supervisors who had supervised other JOBS Project trainees in addition to the one from the interview sample: among the supervisors of the male trainees, 12%, 39% and 38% in Groups I, II and III, respectively; among the supervisors of the female trainees, 18%, 45% and 36% in Groups I, II and III, respectively.

**Trainees who never heard of project were eliminated from chi-square computations; "pro-con" and "negative" categories combined.

***"Depends" and "probably would not" categories combined.

to the general population from which they came. It is important to recall that the trainees came to this project as volunteers, interested in getting out of the vicious circle in which they lived. Therefore, even among those who did least well, we might expect a certain amount of interest, involvement and motivation. Even when their job experiences were disappointing for them, they do not appear to have had any unusually negative impact on the companies in the community.

Summary

In this chapter we have proposed two criteria of success to differentiate the trainees that were the subject of this study. One criterion is the trainee's total earnings in the six-month period following the JOBS Project. The other relates to his history in the project, distinguishing the dropouts from the graduates and, within the latter, those who were placed by the project when they graduated from those who were placed at a later date or not at all.

Since the earnings criterion is based on data given by the trainees, some check on the accuracy of the trainees' reports was provided by comparing them with data given by the supervisors of the trainees' first post-program jobs. Some external validation of these criteria was also presented by relating them to evaluations and ratings of the trainee by their project staff and job supervisors.

In addition to relating these criteria to staff and supervisory evaluations, they were also related to characteristics of the trainee's post-program job history, as well as other trainee behavior in the post-project period (job seeking activity and attempts at getting further schooling). In the relationships with the job history data, it was shown that the trainees who were higher and lower on the earnings criterion differed both in the wage rates on their jobs and in the proportion of time they worked during that period. On the other criterion, however, the trainees who graduated and were placed by the project differed from the dropouts and other graduates only in the regularity of their employment; they did not obtain jobs with higher wage rates. This difference between the two criteria is reflected in the fact that we found less relationship between dropout-placement and other factors than was true with respect to the earnings criterion.

The fact that trainees of higher and lower earnings differed in both wage rates and regularity of employment is reflected in the relationships between the earnings index and other factors. The differences in wage rates seem to reflect some ability differentiation among the higher and lower trainees, a difference in what they could command in the job world. In addition to the fact that their jobs had lower wage rates, the less favorable bargaining position of the lower earning trainees was reflected in the failure of their job-seeking activity - they were very often turned down for jobs they sought and rarely were in the position of rejecting a job they could have attained. Ability differences among these high and low earning trainees were also suggested by the fact that they were rated by project staff members as differing in ability before the staff knew what their earnings would be.

The differences among high and low earning trainees in the regularity of their employment, in their tendency to stay with a job, suggest that there may also have been attitudinal and motivational differences among them. Tentative support for this interpretation comes from other findings discussed in this chapter: some tendency for the low earning trainees to less often seek further schooling and training; the suggestion of apathy and discouragement in their job-seeking behavior; the differences in the ratings on motivational and attitudinal dimensions by the supervisors of the high and low earning trainees.

With these characteristics of the two criteria in mind, we will turn in the next two chapters to a systematic examination of the relationships of these criteria to the trainees' social and background characteristics and to some measures of his attitudes and motivations. With respect to the earnings criterion, we will look for evidences of both ability and attitudinal factors differentiating trainees of higher and lower earnings. With the dropout-placement criterion, we will expect to find less relationship with other factors, since it seems to be a less meaningful measure of "success," at least for the trainees who were enrolled in the JOBS-I Project.

The data in the following chapters will be presented separately for men and women trainees. In the present chapter we have noted some striking differences in the post-program job histories of the men and women in the study. Women much more often had no jobs at all and the jobs they did have tended to be less well paid. With many women making no money at all and very few getting paid enough to put them into the relatively higher earnings brackets that a number of the men achieved, there was less variation in the earnings index among women and, hence, less opportunity for it to reflect attitudinal and ability differences. We will see some of the consequences of this in the following chapters where we will note some tendency for the earnings index to show less relationship with other factors among the women than among the men.

CHAPTER IV

Factors Related to Success: Social and Background Characteristics

It is a commonplace in the vast literature of surveys of broad heterogeneous populations to demonstrate that attitudes and behaviors vary considerably in the different social strata of our society. Factors such as age, education, religion, ethnic background, income and occupational status, are often strikingly related to attitudes, values and behavior patterns.

In this study, however, we were dealing with a population that was relatively homogeneous with respect to these characteristics. The JOBS Project was directed toward a population of certain characteristics - undereducated inner-city Negro youth from a poverty background, an environment of limited occupational opportunity with a job history that was either nonexistent or limited to sporadic unskilled jobs.

However, granted that the study population was not as heterogeneous as a random sample of the nation as a whole, there was still some degree of variation within it. Although, with a few exceptions, the age of the trainees varied only from 18 to 22, this range does cover a period when dramatic changes can occur in a person's relationship to the job world. Although the population as a whole was undereducated and the average performance on reading tests was below the sixth grade level, the range went from zero to grade 12.5. The range in IQ scores was from 42 to 131.

It is important, therefore, not to assume that the social and background characteristics were so homogeneous in this population that there was not enough variation to enable one to relate these background characteristics to attitudes and behaviors of the trainees. This chapter, therefore, will be devoted to an exploration of these differences. Specifically, we will be concerned with the relationships to our success criteria of trainee variation in the following characteristics: age and family responsibilities; previous job history; educational attainment; social environment and family background.

Age and Family Responsibilities

Although the age range of our population was a very narrow one, it covers the period of life when people are in the process of entering the job market. Therefore, we might expect that even within this narrow range the difference of a year or two might be related significantly to our two success criteria.

Table 33 presents the relationship between the age of the trainee and the dropout-placement criterion. The figures in Table 33 refer to the trainees' age at the time of the post-program interview rather than their age upon entering the program since we are primarily interested in the meaning of age at the time the person is in the job market.

Table 33 indicates that despite the narrow age range encompassed by the study population, there was a clear relationship between the age of the trainee and whether he dropped out or remained in the program to the end, at least for

TABLE 33

Relation of Dropout-Placement to Age

	Males			Females		
	I	II	III	I	II	III
Age (at time of post-program interview)	Dropouts (N = 47)	Late or Nonplaced Graduates (N = 36)	Early Placed Graduates (N = 100)	Dropouts (N = 63)	Late or Nonplaced Graduates (N = 29)	Early Placed Graduates (N = 59)
Under 20	32%	8%	6%	5%	10%	7%
20	30	28	29	28	35	34
21	19	33	33	42	35	27
22	17	19	22	10	17	22
Over 22	2	12	10	15	3	10
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Mean	20.26	21.06	21.23	21.33	20.69	21.05

Significant t-tests: I vs. II,** III* (Males) I vs. II*** (Females)

Significance levels:
* .01
** .05
*** .10
All comparisons not indicated in the table were not significant.

the male trainees. Among the men, dropout clearly occurred more often among the younger trainees. Thirty-two percent of the male trainees who had dropped out of the program were under 20 years of age at the time of the post-program interview in contrast to only 8 percent and 6 percent of the two graduating groups. (Among the program graduates there were no age differences between those placed upon graduation and the others.)

The comparison of the findings for the men and women trainees is particularly interesting in Table 33. Among the women the relationship between age and dropout, though not as significant as it was for the men, was opposite in direction. Among the women the dropouts were, if anything, older than those who remained in the program until graduation, particularly when compared to the less successful graduates. There seemed to be a tendency, then, for age to operate very differently for males and females. Among the male trainees it was the younger ones who more often dropped out; among the females it was the older ones.

The relationship between age and dropout can mean many things. One important possibility would seem to be that differences in age reflect differences in family responsibilities and that these would help explain the findings we have noted in Table 33. Table 34, therefore, presents the relationship between dropout-placement and several questions indicating the family responsibilities of the trainees: whether the trainees were living at home with their parents, their marital status and the number of children they had, the main breadwinner in their household.

TABLE 34

Relation of Dropout-Placement to Family Responsibilities of Trainees

		Males			Females		
		I Dropouts (N = 47)	II Late or Nonplaced Graduates (N = 36)	III Early Placed Graduates (N = 100)	I Dropouts (N = 63)	II Late or Nonplaced Graduates (N = 29)	III Early Placed Graduates (N = 59)
Proportion of trainees living at home with parents		61%	61%	52%	43%	66%	53%
			All NS		I vs. II, p = .05. All others NS		
Proportion of trainees married		19%	14%	25%	33%	17%	19%
			All NS			All NS	
Proportion of women living with children with no husband		-	-	-	24%	22%	25%
						All NS	
Number of children	None	70%	69%	63%	40%	55%	57%
	One	17	11	19	27	21	26
	Two or more	13	20	18	33	24	17
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
			All NS		I vs. III, Chi^2 = 4.924, df = 2, p = .10. All others NS.		
"Main breadwinner" in trainee's household							
	Trainee	23%	22%	33%	14%	7%	20%
	Father or other male	49	39	34	25	41	37
	Mother or other female	21	25	19	17	20	19
	Spouse	2	0	0	35	17	17
	More than one, none, or not ascertained	5	14	14	9	15	7
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
			All NS			All NS	

If we look first at the findings for the male trainees in Table 34, we see some slight relationships reflecting the age differences we have already discussed. There was some tendency for the dropouts who, we recall, tended to be younger, to more often be living at home with their parents, with the parent rather than they themselves the main breadwinner in the household. The relationships were not significant, however, and occurred only in the comparison between dropouts and early placed graduates.

When we look at the findings for the females in Table 34, we again find some reflection of the age differences in the family responsibility data. The fact that women dropouts tended to be older is reflected in the indications that they also tended to be more often married, with children, with a spouse the main breadwinner in the family. We may summarize the findings from Tables 33 and 34 as follows: among the men, the young trainee living at home and supported by his parents was more likely to drop out; among the women, dropout was more likely to occur among the older trainees, married and supported by their husbands, particularly in cases where the woman trainee had two or more children. These findings with respect to family responsibility were not significant, however, particularly when we compare them to the relationships with the other success criterion of post-program earnings. We turn to those findings now.

Table 35 presents the relationship between age of trainee and the job earnings in the post-program world and Table 36 follows up these findings by looking at the relationship between age and the trainee's family responsibilities.

TABLE 35

Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Age

	Males				Females			
Age (at time of post-program interview)	I Lowest Earnings (N=46)	II (N=39)	III (N=38)	IV Highest Earnings (N=42)	I Lowest Earnings (N=35)	II (N=29)	III (N=32)	IV Highest Earnings (N=32)
Under 20	24%	7%	13%	5%	6%	10%	6%	6%
20	37	29	29	17	26	46	38	28
21	20	29	29	33	42	35	19	38
22	15	29	16	31	20	3	22	19
Over 22	4	6	13	14	6	6	15	9
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100	100%	100%
Mean	20.46	20.95	21.00	21.71	21.03	20.86	21.25	20.97
Significant t-tests:	IV vs I,** II***				All NS			

Significance levels: **.05
***.10
All comparisons not indicated in the table were not significant.

Among the male trainees we find the same pattern of results that was noted with respect to the dropout-placement criterion, only now it appears in a more striking fashion. There was a direct and clear relationship between the age of the trainees and the extent of their post-program earnings. As we go from the lowest to the highest earning quartile the average age of the male trainees goes progressively from 20.46 years of age to 21.71 (Table 35). Even more striking are the findings in Table 36 which indicate the differences in family responsibilities that go with these age differences. Higher earnings among the trainees were very strikingly related to the greater family responsibilities that are associated with being older. Eighty-two percent of the lowest earning quartile of male trainees were living at home with their parents in contrast to only 38 percent in the highest quartile; 7 percent of the lowest group were married, contrasted to 31 percent in the highest group; 20 percent in the lowest group had children to support in contrast to 48 percent in the highest group. Job earnings among the men, in short, were very clearly related to the pressure and responsibility that come with familial responsibilities, with increased age being a reflection of these responsibilities.

The findings with respect to the women in Tables 35 and 36 were much less clear cut. There was no clear relationship between age and job earnings (Table 35). In the area of familial responsibility (Table 36), only one factor stands out, namely, that a woman with two or more children is very strikingly limited in the job market. Whereas 44 percent of the women in the lowest earnings quartile had two or more children, this was true with respect to only 6 percent of those in the highest quartile. It is interesting that the critical issue apparently was not whether the woman was married and had a child, but the presence of a second child. This greatly limited a woman's activity and effectiveness in the job market.

Except for these findings, however, Table 36 presents no other clear indications of a relationship between familial responsibility and job earnings among the women trainees. There was no straight, linear relationship between earnings and whether the trainee was married or living at home with her parents, two factors which were very strikingly significant for the male trainees. To some extent this may represent the operation of two contradictory factors among the women trainees which effectively cancel each other out. The greater the family responsibility, as indicated in being married and not living at home, the greater the need to work. However, when these responsibilities mean children, particularly the presence of two or more children, it creates a situation where it is important to remain at home and where it is increasingly difficult to work. The situation is thus more complex in the case of women than it is for men. Among men the responsibility of being married and not living at home means the increased need to work without imposing any limitations on the possibilities of working. Hence, for the men a very clear and linear relationship obtains between job earnings and increasing family responsibilities. For women, the relationship appears to be somewhat curvilinear, with married women not living at home being more heavily represented in both the highest and lowest earnings quartiles.

In the preceding chapter, in the discussion of the development of the earnings index, we noted that we have eliminated those trainees who were very clearly and explicitly not in the job market at any point during the six-month post-program period that we have used as the baseline for the index. The data in Table 36, therefore, apply only to those people formally and ostensibly in the job market during that period. The findings suggest, however, that being in the market formally does not always imply an active involvement in it. The

TABLE 36

Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Family Responsibilities of Trainees

		Males				Females			
		I Lowest Earnings (N = 46)	II (N = 39)	III (N = 38)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 42)	I Lowest Earnings (N = 35)	II (N = 29)	III (N = 32)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 32)
Proportion of trainees living at home with parents		82%	54%	53%	38%	41%	59%	53%	47%
		I vs II, III, IV p=.01. All others NS				All NS			
Proportion of trainees married		7%	21%	26%	31%	38%	14%	16%	25%
		I vs III, IV p=.01. All others NS				I vs II p=.01, I vs III p=.05. Others			
Proportion of women living with children with no husband		-	-	-	-	27%	22%	26%	19%
						All NS			
Number of children	None	80%	69%	63%	52%	44%	62%	53%	63%
	One	11	13	16	29	12	28	22	31
	Two or more	9	18	21	19	44	10	25	6
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		Chi^2 = 11.2155, df = 6, p = .10				Chi^2 = 15.769, df = 6, p = .01			
"Main breadwinner" in trainee's household									
	Trainee	4%	33%	26%	48%	9%	3%	25%	22%
	Father or other male	48	46	34	24	23	51	41	32
	Mother or other female	34	16	24	12	23	27	16	16
	Spouse	2	0	0	0	37	14	16	25
	More than one, none, or not ascertained	12	5	16	16	8	5	2	5
		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		Chi^2 = 25.134, df = 6*, p = .001				Chi^2 = 15.8379, df = 9**, p = .10			

*"Spouse" and "more than one . . ." categories not included in Chi^2 computation.
**"More than one . . ." categories not included in Chi^2 computation.

findings suggest that the lower earners among the men trainees who were younger, living at home, and not the main support of their families, may have, to some extent "opted out" of the job-seeking market. Similarly, many of the women with two or more children may also essentially have been out of the market.

This does not mean that the young men "did not want" to work or that they would not have been more active in a job market that offered them jobs with greater opportunities and rewards than was true of the jobs available to them. The young men were not necessarily rejecting work, but they did seem to be rejecting the kind of work available to them, at least as long as their life situation permitted them to do so.

This is an important distinction. A great deal of concern has been expressed over the special problem of unemployment among Negro youth. The unusually high unemployment rates in that group have sometimes been interpreted as though Negro youth had particular disadvantages in the job market, even in relation to older Negroes. Jobs may be less available to this sector of the labor market but there is also another problem which can be highlighted in this trainee population. Among them, no special disadvantages or problems distinguished the younger from the older trainees; the major difference was that the younger trainees, with fewer responsibilities, had more option to reject what was available to them. High unemployment rates should not distract us from a basic issue which is less the unavailability of any jobs than it is the kinds of jobs that are available. This also has obvious implications for the direction in which solutions to such problems must go. They lie not in providing for Negro youth "a" job - which simply keeps them busy and off the streets - but in making it possible for them to find and compete for meaningful jobs.

Bayard Rustin (1967) has expressed this point very well.

> Nor is there any evidence that Negro teen-agers do not want to work. Wherever job programs have been announced, they have turned out in large numbers, only to find that the jobs weren't there. In Oakland, a "Job Fair" attracted 15,000 people; only 250 were placed. In Philadelphia, 6,000 were on a waiting list for a training program.
>
> What Negro teen-agers are not inclined to accept are dead-end jobs that pay little and promise no advancement or training. They want to be part of the white collar organization man's world that is America's future, not trapped behind brooms and pushcarts. (p. 16)

Pre-Program Job History

In the preceding section we have pointed to certain immediate situational determinants of a trainee's decision to stay in or leave the program, as well as of his working and earnings in the post-program job world. Most of the findings in the remainder of this and the following chapter will point to other factors that may have more long-range implications for a trainee's earning potential.

In the preceding chapter we have already noted certain ways in which the situation of the low-earning trainees tends to represent a self-reinforcing cycle of low wage rates and sporadic employment. Some evidence of the continuity of these patterns over time is suggested when we relate their post-program working patterns to their job histories before they entered the program.

In the interviews trainees were asked a set of questions about their job history in the period before they entered the JOBS Project. On the basis of this information the trainees were divided into three categories: those who had never had a regular job; those who had had one but for never as long as five months; and those who at some point in their lives had had a job for five months or longer.

Table 37 presents the relationship between this preceding job history and dropout-placement and Table 38 the relationship with post-program earnings. We see in these tables that for both men and women trainees there are some relationships between the pre-program job history and the two success criteria, particularly the criterion of job earnings in the post-program world. For both men and women trainees, the post-program earnings were to some extent a continuation of job and earning patterns existing before they entered the JOBS Project.[1] For example, among the men, whereas 44 percent of the trainees in the lowest earnings quartile had never had a regular job in the pre-program period, this was true of only 24 percent of those in the highest earning quartile.

To some extent this continuity is merely a reiteration of the findings with respect to age and family responsibilities discussed above. If the men trainees with the lowest post-program earnings tended to be younger and with less family responsibilities at the time of the post-program interview, they were even younger and with less responsibilities in the period before they entered the JOBS Project. Among the women trainees, the children that inhibited their job activity were also in most cases present in the pre-project period. But Tables 39 and 40, in pointing to the continuity of the post-program behavior with the job behavior of several years before, also suggest that job earnings may be reflecting some factors beyond those of a trainee's immediate life situation. What some of these factors are will be discussed in the section that follows.

Educational Background and Achievement

In the literature of survey research, educational background is probably the factor which has shown the most consistent and striking relationship with a person's attitudes and behavior. The usual studies, however, have dealt with broad populations that permitted comparisons among people ranging from college graduates to those who never completed grade school. It is less common to look for significant differences within a population with the much narrower educational range represented by the trainees in this study.

Tables 39 and 40 present the relationships between the trainee's formal education and the two success criteria. These findings are presented for two reports of the trainees' education: one given by the trainee in the post-program interview; the other obtained from the records in the JOBS Project. Since these records came from interviews taken with the trainees by JOBS Project personnel before they entered the project, the two reports to some extent serve as a check upon each other. As indicated in Tables 39 and 40, although the figures vary to some extent, the data obtained from them present essentially the same set of relationships. The striking finding of these two tables, particularly the

---

[1] Although not significant by the Chi^2 test, the relationship between pre-program job history and post-program earnings was significant when means in earnings of the different pre-program history categories were compared.

TABLE 37

Relation of Dropout-Placement to Pre-Program Job History

	Males			Females		
	I Dropouts (N = 47)	II Late or Nonplaced Graduates (N = 36)	III Early Placed Graduates (N = 100)	I Dropouts (N = 63)	II Late or Nonplaced Graduates (N = 29)	III Early Placed Graduates (N = 59)
Pre-Program Job History						
No previous regular job	49%	31%	31%	40%	47%	41%
Previous regular job - less than 5 mo	21	24	30	33	37	22
Previous regular job - 5 months or longer	30	45	39	27	16	37
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Males: I vs. III, $Chi^2 = 4.895$, $p = .10$
All others NS

Females: All NS

TABLE 38

Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Pre-Program Job History

	Males				Females			
	I Lowest Earnings (N = 46)	II (N = 39)	III (N = 38)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 42)	I Lowest Earnings (N = 35)	II (N = 29)	III (N = 32)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 32)
Pre-Program Job History								
No previous regular job	44%	33%	34%	24%	47%	40%	50%	32%
Previous regular job - less than 5 mo	32	15	26	29	39	30	25	21
Previous regular job - 5 months or longer	24	52	40	47	14	30	25	47
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Males: $Chi^2 = 8.835$, $df = 6$, $p = NS$

Females: $Chi^2 = 6.644$, $df = 6$, $p = NS$

TABLE 39

Relation of Dropout-Placement to Education

	Males			Females		
	I Dropouts (N = 47)	II Late or Nonplaced Graduates (N = 36)	III Early Placed Graduates (N = 100)	I Dropouts (N = 63)	II Late or Nonplaced Graduates (N = 29)	III Early Placed Graduates (N = 59)
Education (as reported by trainees in post-program interview)						
9th grade or less	10%	33%	13%	12%	10%	3%
10th grade	29	37	19	19	30	19
11th grade	41	20	33	36	15	30
12th grade or higher	20	10	35	33	45	48
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Means on eight-point scale#	5.63	4.83	5.88	5.91	5.90	6.35
Significant t-tests		II vs I** III*			I vs III***	
Education (as obtained from JOBS Project records)						
9th grade or less	31%	35%	20%	22%	8%	11%
10th grade	19	32	22	23	25	31
11th grade	31	15	35	26	38	22
12th grade or higher	19	18	23	29	29	36
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Means on eight-point scale#	5.19	4.91	5.48	5.59	5.92	5.84
Significant t-tests		II vs III***			All NS	

Significance levels:
* .01
** .05
*** .10
All comparisons not indicated in the table were not significant.

#In order not to give undue emphasis to extreme cases, means were computed on the basis of the following eight-point scale: four grades or less (one); five or six grades (two); seven or eight grades (three); nine grades (four); ten grades (five); eleven grades (six); twelve grades (seven); post-high school (eight).

TABLE 40

Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Education

	Males				Females			
	I Lowest Earnings (N = 46)	II (N = 39)	III (N = 38)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 42)	I Lowest Earnings (N = 35)	II (N = 29)	III (N = 32)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 32)
Education (as reported by trainees in post-program interview)								
9th grade or less	26%	24%	15%	6%	18%	4%	4%	4%
10th grade	31	29	18	12	26	23	29	0
11th grade	33	24	35	44	37	31	29	18
12th grade or higher	10	23	32	38	19	42	38	78
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Means on eight-point scale#	5.05	5.38	5.85	6.12	5.44	6.19	6.04	6.89
Significant t-tests	I vs III**; IV* II vs IV**				IV vs I*; II**; III* I vs II**			
Education (as obtained from JOBS Project records)								
9th grade or less	31%	30%	25%	16%	20%	8%	19%	5%
10th grade	35	26	16	18	29	27	19	14
11th grade	23	18	28	48	31	34	30	14
12th grade or higher	11	26	31	18	20	31	32	67
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Means on eight-point scale#	4.86	5.13	5.59	5.63	5.51	5.85	5.78	6.43
Significant t-tests	I vs III**; IV*				IV vs I*; II***; III***			

Significance levels:
* .01
** .05
*** .10
All comparisons not indicated in the table were not significant.

#In order not to give undue emphasis to extreme cases, means were computed on the basis of the following eight-point scale: four grades or less (one); five or six grades (two); seven or eight grades (three); nine grades (four); ten grades (five); eleven grades (six); twelve grades (seven); post-high school (eight).

relationship with earnings presented in Table 40, is that even within this homogeneous population the variation in educational background has significant implications.

The tendency in describing a population of people like those represented in this study, is to categorize all of them as undereducated and to view their school experiences in an undifferentiated way as negative and meaningless. Without in any way negating some of these general observations, the data in these tables indicate that there is still some educational variation within this population and that whether or not a person remains in school a year or two more represents something very clearly related to his behavior within and after the program. For example, if we look at those with the greatest amount of education in this population, that is, those who had completed eleventh or twelfth grade or more, and focus for the moment on the data obtained from the JOBS Project records, we see that among the men they represented 34 percent of the trainees in the lowest success quartile, 44 percent of those in the next lowest, 59 percent of those in the third and 66 percent of those in the highest (Table 40). Among the women trainees, the comparable figures are 51 percent, 75 percent, 62 percent and 81 percent.

The findings with respect to the drop-out criterion (Table 39) are somewhat less clear. Among the women, the dropouts did appear to be somewhat less educated although this was not consistently significant. Among the male trainees, the critical distinction seems to have occurred within the category of trainees who graduated, the later or nonplaced graduates being much less educated than those who were early placements. This is not a surprising finding since whether or not a graduate was placed immediately should be related to his ability, and this we would expect to be related to education.

These findings with respect to formal education are paralleled by relationships between the two success criteria, particularly the earnings criterion, and the actual educational achievement of the trainees. Among the tests given to the trainees during the course of the project was the Stanford Intermediate Test battery in reading and arithmetic. The JOBS Project staff recognized the problems in using tests such as these with the population in this project. For example, in their final report they noted that the reading tests were inadequate on two counts: "they are designed for children of elementary level and their content is further biased toward the middle-class culture." Despite these limitations, they felt the tests might give at least some rough indication of a trainee's level of accomplishment in reading and arithmetic, and his improvement in these areas during the course of the training. Thus, they gave these tests to the trainees upon entering the program and at several stages during the course of the project.

Tables 41 and 42 present the relationships between our two success criteria and the trainees' performance on these tests, the latter including the test administration given at the time the trainees entered the program and two later administrations given during the program's course. The results clearly parallel those we have already noted with respect to formal education. There was no clear relationship between educational achievement and dropout-placement but, at least for the male trainees, a clear relationship between job earnings and performance on these tests. This relationship was particularly apparent with the third administration of the test, given at a time shortly before the trainees actually left the program and went out into the job market. This third administration, then, represents the best approximation of the educational level at which the trainee was functioning at the time he went into the job world.

TABLE 41

Relation of Dropout-Placement to Educational Achievement Tests

	Males			Females		
	I Dropouts	II Late or Nonplaced Graduates	III Early Placed Graduates	I Dropouts	II Late or Nonplaced Graduates	III Early Placed Graduates
Means on Stanford Arithmetic and Reading Tests: Eight-point scales with 1 representing less than 4th grade level and 8 representing over 10th grade level; 3 represents 5th grade and 4 represents 6th grade						
Reading - first administration	4.07 (N = 30)	3.55 (N = 29) All NS	4.10 (N = 68)	3.92 (N = 48)	3.84 (N = 25) All NS	3.77 (N = 40)
Reading - second administration	3.81 (N = 21)	3.64 (N = 25) All NS	4.07 (N = 57)	4.11 (N = 38)	4.71 (N = 21) All NS	4.31 (N = 32)
Reading - third administration	4.58 (N = 19)	3.72 (N = 18) All NS	4.03 (N = 61)	4.91 (N = 33)	4.95 (N = 20) All NS	4.41 (N = 41)
Arithmetic - first administration	3.25 (N = 28)	3.07 (N = 27) All NS	3.59 (N = 63)	3.48 (N = 42)	3.23 (N = 26) All NS	3.43 (N = 37)
Arithmetic - second administration	3.76 (N = 21)	3.68 (N = 25) All NS	3.98 (N = 59)	4.18 (N = 38)	4.14 (N = 21) All NS	4.13 (N = 32)
Arithmetic - third administration	3.63 (N = 19)	3.42 (N = 19) All NS	3.93 (N = 59)	4.06 (N = 33)	4.35 (N = 20) All NS	4.22 (N = 41)

TABLE 42

Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Educational Achievement Tests

	Males				Females			
	I Lowest Earnings	II	III	IV Highest Earnings	I Lowest Earnings	II	III	IV Highest Earnings
Means on Stanford Arithmetic and Reading Tests: Eight-point scales with 1 representing less than 4th grade level and 8 representing over 10th grade level; 3 represents 5th grade and 4 represents 6th grade								
Reading - first administration	3.60 (N = 40)	4.00 (N = 27)	3.82 (N = 22)	4.68 (N = 28)	3.62 (N = 29)	3.90 (N = 21)	4.08 (N = 24)	4.00 (N = 21)
	I vs IV***				All NS			
Reading - second administration	3.83 (N = 30)	3.72 (N = 25)	4.00 (N = 18)	4.45 (N = 22)	3.64 (N = 25)	4.93 (N = 14)	4.17 (N = 23)	4.63 (N = 19)
	All NS				I vs II**			
Reading - third administration	3.38 (N = 26)	3.77 (N = 26)	3.83 (N = 18)	5.17 (N = 24)	4.50 (N = 18)	4.50 (N = 18)	4.62 (N = 21)	4.93 (N = 21)
	IV vs I;* II;** III***				All NS			
Arithmetic - first administration	2.94 (N = 34)	3.56 (N = 24)	3.59 (N = 22)	3.65 (N = 26)	3.40 (N = 25)	3.63 (N = 19)	3.29 (N = 24)	3.55 (N = 20)
	I vs IV***				All NS			
Arithmetic - second administration	3.57 (N = 30)	3.72 (N = 25)	3.89 (N = 18)	4.17 (N = 24)	3.96 (N = 25)	4.21 (N = 14)	4.17 (N = 23)	4.53 (N = 19)
	All NS				All NS			
Arithmetic - third administration	2.96 (N = 26)	3.56 (N = 25)	3.83 (N = 18)	4.67 (N = 24)	4.06 (N = 17)	4.05 (N = 19)	4.38 (N = 21)	4.76 (N = 21)
	I vs III,*** IV;* II vs IV**				II vs IV***			

Significance levels: * .01
** .05
*** .10
All comparisons not indicated in the table were not significant.

It is not surprising that educational background and achievement were more related to job earnings than to the dropout-placement criterion. It will be recalled from the discussion of the preceding chapter that the earnings index was a function of both the wage rate of the job and the amount of time spent in working; dropout-placement, on the other hand, was almost completely a function of the amount of time spent working. Dropouts and program graduates did not differ significantly in the wage rates of the jobs they received. We would expect that educational attainment would be particularly related to a person's ability and the quality of the job he was able to receive, rather than to length of time on that job. Thus, we would expect the findings reported in Tables 41 and 42, which indicate a greater relationship between educational attainment and earnings than obtains with respect to dropout-placement.

It should once again be cautioned that this implication that the dropouts may not have differed in ability from the most successful project graduates may reflect some of the problems JOBS-I experienced in providing meaningful skill training for the people in the program. If the program had been more successful in placing its graduates in jobs using skills for which they had been trained, we might have found differences in ability between dropouts and program graduates. On the other hand, the lack of ability differences suggested in this study may also reflect a characteristic of most experimental and demonstration programs, namely, that they generally make an effort to do something with all trainees and do not use low ability as a criterion for dropping trainees.

The discussion from the preceding chapter also helps explain why the relationship between educational achievement and earnings presented in Table 42 was more striking for the men than for the women trainees. We noted that the wage rates of the jobs they attained were significantly lower for women than men. Women were particularly less represented among the higher wage rates (over $1.75 an hour),[2] for which the more educated trainees would be particularly eligible. Given less opportunity for women trainees to get jobs that reward a little more education, we would expect them to show less relationship between educational attainment and earnings.

One further comment might be made on the relationships between educational attainment and the dropout-placement criterion. As we have already noted, in no instance were these relationships statistically significant. However, although not statistically significant, a consistent tendency did appear among the male trainees, for the late or nonplaced graduates to indicate a lower level of educational attainment than either the dropout or the early placed group. This occurred for both the reading and arithmetic tests on all three of the test administrations. Again, this indicates the special problems in this group of men trainees.

As a final note, it should be cautioned that the differences with respect to educational attainment that have been discussed in this section do not necessarily reflect any "natural" capacity differences among our trainees. The education a person achieves and the educational level at which he functions are related to the motivation for such achievement. One cannot, of course, separate the influence of motivation and "capacity." However, it might be of interest to note in this connection that the battery of tests administered by the JOBS

---

[2] See Chapter III, Table 17.

Project included one which made some attempt to get at the issue of general "intelligence." Again, while recognizing all the limitations in this approach, the JOBS Project administered the revised Beta IQ Test to all trainees when they entered the program. This is a test which is nonverbal and brief and thus lacks some of the obvious inadequacies of a more standard IQ test with this population.

Table 43 presents the relationship of the scores on this test to the two success criteria. There are no consistent systematic relationships apparent in these two tables, and they in no way parallel the findings on educational background and achievement. While any interpretation of findings from tests such as these should be made with great caution, these findings may suggest that the relationship between educational attainment and job earnings that we obtained was more a reflection of the motivation to achieve some educational competence than of any "innate" capacity to do so. Whatever the reasons for the differences in educational attainment, however, the results do clearly indicate that the level attained was related to later earnings in the job world.

One final comment is relevant. In Chapter II we noted the problems that projects such as these face in making basic educational instruction relevant to the trainees, in helping them see that their educational attainment can have payoffs in the job world. The findings we have noted in this chapter suggest that such payoffs do in fact exist, even within the very limited educational range represented by the people in this population.

Social Environment and Family Background

A great deal of concern is expressed these days about the "culture of the ghetto," the "unemployed community," the disorganization of the family among the population represented by the trainees in this project. We made an attempt in this study to get measures of some of the social environmental and family background characteristics that might be related to our success criteria, particularly to job earnings. We will discuss these findings briefly in the remainder of this chapter.

One question of interest is the extent to which patterns of employment and unemployment are socially supported by parallel patterns appearing among an individual's peers and within his family. Some of these relationships are presented in Table 44. The relationship with peer patterns was measured by the responses to a series of questions in which the trainee was asked to name his five best friends and to indicate whether they were employed or unemployed. The measurement of familial patterns comes from the mother's interview, where the mother was asked to list all the adults in the household and to indicate whether they were employed or unemployed. In the measurement of work patterns, it was felt that the appropriate reference group would differ for the male and female trainees. For the male trainee, the critical question should be the extent to which the male adults in the family were working or not working. For women the trainees' point of reference might more appropriately be the employment or lack of employment of all the adults in the familial household. It will be noted that these findings on familial patterns refer to the employment of the adults in the trainee's mother's household, even in instances where the trainee had formed his own household, since our concern is with the patterns in the general familial background from which the trainee came.

The findings presented in Table 44 support the widely held assumption that the employment and unemployment patterns in this group, as in any other group,

TABLE 43

Relation of Dropout-Placement and Post Program Earnings to Beta Intelligence Test Scores

A. Dropout-Placement

	Males			Females		
	I Dropouts (N = 30)	II Late or Nonplaced Graduates (N = 28)	III Early Placed Graduates (N = 79)	I Dropouts (N = 64)	II Late or Nonplaced Graduates (N = 26)	III Early Placed Graduates (N = 33)
Mean Beta Scores: Seven-point scale with 1 representing score of 70 or less and 7 a score over 120; 3 represents the 81 to 90 interval	3.77	3.93	3.44	3.20	3.19	3.33
		II vs III***			All NS	

B. Post-Program Earnings

	Males				Females			
	I Lowest Earnings (N = 37)	II (N = 32)	III (N = 23)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 34)	I Lowest Earnings (N = 27)	II (N = 23)	III (N = 27)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 21)
Mean Beta Scores	3.68	3.50	3.17	3.88	2.96	3.43	3.11	3.62
			III vs IV***			All NS		

Significance levels: ** .05
*** .10
All comparisons not indicated in the table were not significant.

TABLE 44

Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Working Patterns in Social Environment

	I Lowest Earnings	II	III	IV Highest Earnings	I Lowest Earnings	II	III	IV Highest Earnings
Number of five best friends unemployed: Trainee's report	1.76	1.08	0.95	0.92	2.41	1.96	1.70	1.75
	(N = 46)	(N = 39)	(N = 38)	(N = 42)	(N = 35)	(N = 29)	(N = 32)	(N = 32)
		I vs II,** III,* IV*				I vs III,*** IV***		
Average proportion of male adults employed in trainee's mother's household: Mother's report	70%	75%	83%	95%	-	-	-	-
	(N = 23)	(N = 25)	(N = 16)	(N = 17)				
		IV vs I,* II**						
Average proportion of all adults employed in trainee's mother's household: Mother's report	-	-	-	-	52%	64%	68%	58%
					(N = 26)	(N = 18)	(N = 18)	(N = 21)
						All NS		

Significance levels: * .01
** .05
*** .10
NS Not significant
All comparisons not indicated in the table were not significant.

are socially influenced and supported phenomena. The trainees in the lowest job earnings quartile, which included trainees who either did not work at all in the six-month baseline period or who were unemployed large proportions of that time, tended to have more friends who were also unemployed than was true of the trainees who were working more often and earning more money. There was also some indication for the male trainees that earning patterns were not only related to those in the immediate peer environment but also to those obtaining in the familial background. Men trainees with higher job earnings came from families where a larger proportion of the male adults were working, the difference going from 70 percent of the male adults working in the lowest earnings quartile to 95 percent in the highest quartile.

The findings with respect to the employment patterns of the trainees' best friends are perhaps not too meaningful since they in no way indicate that the friends' patterns are necessarily influencing the trainees' patterns. Rather, they might indicate that a person who is unemployed seeks out and finds others who are also unemployed. The relationship with the patterns in the familial background are of more interest since they do suggest that such patterns can influence the trainees' own behavior in this area. Even the friends' findings, however, do suggest that whatever the direction of the causality of the relationship, unemployment patterns do become imbedded in a context of social support.

In Table 44 the data for the women trainees do not indicate any relationship between a trainee's earnings and the working patterns in the familial background. This does not necessarily suggest that these patterns are unimportant for female trainees. The relevance of familial work patterns is more ambiguous for women trainees; it is less clear what prediction one should make about the relation between familial background and whether or not a woman will work. The relationship for the men is clear: we expect a direct relationship between a man's working and the extent to which the male figures in his family work or do not work. With a woman, however, the prediction is more questionable. To some extent, the most "successful" backgrounds could be ones in which the men are able completely to provide for the family and the women do not have to work. Therefore, the lack of any relationship for the women in Table 44 may merely indicate that the way such family influence should operate for women trainees is not clear and not that family background is irrelevant in their case.

Family background has always been considered an important area. Its significance, however, has been particularly highlighted in the past two years in the discussion that has been evoked by the Moynihan Report (1965). That report has particularly highlighted the issue of family disorganization and the absence of the father and other stable male figures from the homes of the population represented by our trainees. In Table 45, therefore, we present the findings on the relationship between the job earnings criterion and several indications of the matriarchal-patriarchal nature of the family structure in the backgrounds of the trainees. Although the discussion of this issue has primarily focused around the relevance of this dimension for young men as they grow up in the family, the findings are presented for both the men and the women trainees, since our interest in this area was largely exploratory.

Table 45 presents the relationship of the job earnings criterion to several indices of family disorganization. Among those trainees who were still living with their parents at the time of our last interview, the table presents data on the proportion of trainees who said there was or was not a father living in the home; for all the trainees in this last interview the table presents the data on

TABLE 45

Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Matriarchal-Patriarchal Family Structure

	Males				Females			
	I Lowest Earnings	II	III	IV Highest Earnings	I Lowest Earnings	II	III	IV Highest Earnings
Among those presently living with parents: proportion of trainees who say there is no father presently in the home	49%	33%	60%	38%	57%	59%	65%	53%
	(N = 37)	(N = 21)	(N = 20)	(N = 16)	(N = 14)	(N = 17)	(N = 17)	(N = 15)
	All NS				All NS			
Proportion of trainees who say father (or step-father) was main breadwinner when they were growing up	63%	64%	55%	64%	53%	55%	75%	71%
	(N = 46)	(N = 39)	(N = 38)	(N = 42)	(N = 35)	(N = 29)	(N = 32)	(N = 32)
	All NS				All NS			
Proportion of trainees who say "real father" was in the home when they were growing up	63%	50%	62%	78%	54%	52%	64%	62%
	(N = 46)	(N = 39)	(N = 38)	(N = 42)	(N = 35)	(N = 29)	(N = 32)	(N = 32)
	II vs IV p = .01; all others NS				All NS			
Proportion of mothers who say "biological father" was in the home "all the time" when trainee was growing up (Mother's interview)	34%	34%	30%	19%	51%	37%	53%	24%
	(N = 33)	(N = 30)	(N = 23)	(N = 21)	(N = 24)	(N = 19)	(N = 19)	(N = 21)
	All NS				I vs IV p = .05; III vs IV p = .05 All others NS			

the trainees' reports of the situation when they were growing up, specifically whether the father or step-father was the main breadwinner in those years and whether the "real" or biological father was in the home when they were growing up; finally, with respect to the latter issue, that is the presence or absence of the biological father in the home when the trainee was growing up, we included the same data from the mother's report, given in the mother's interview. Since the issue of father presence or absence is a very sensitive one, we felt it would be desirable to get at least two independent reports of the situation, the trainee's and the mother's. (Incidentally, it might be noted from the findings in Table 45, that the mother seems to have been, if anything, less sensitive and more honest about this issue, although the questions asked of trainees and mothers were not completely comparable.)

The findings presented in Table 45 indicate no clear consistent relationships between success in the job world as measured by the earnings index and the presence or absence of a father in the home of the trainee during the formative years. Whatever possible relationship is suggested by the trainee's report on the presence or absence of the "real" father during the formative years is contradicted by the data from the mother's interview. Moreover, the most critical question - whether a male figure was the main breadwinner during the early years - shows no relationship at all with the earnings of the men trainees.

There are, perhaps, some tendencies toward a relationship with job earnings when we turn from the issue of the mere presence or absence of the father in the home and look at the identification with male figures, that is, the trainee's attitude toward and feelings about the father or father figure in his background. These findings are presented in Table 46. In the final interview the trainee was asked a series of questions comparing his attitudes toward and identifications with male and female familial figures. The trainee was asked to mention the person in his life who had been most important to him. First and second mentions were coded and Table 46 presents the extent to which the trainee chose the matriarchal rather than the patriarchal figure. The trainee was also asked which of the two parents (or parent substitutes) he "admired" and felt he or she "takes after" more. The extent to which the trainee made the matriarchal or patriarchal choice is also presented in this table.

There is a suggestion in Table 46 that the responses to these questions might have more relationship with job earnings than was true with respect to the physical absence or presence of a father in the home. This is clearest, perhaps, in the responses to the question on which parent the trainee admired more, where we find that only five percent of the male trainees in the lowest quartile mentioned the father or father substitute, in contrast to about one-quarter of the trainees in the other three quartiles. But the relationships were not significant.

The findings, it should be stressed, do not contradict the widely held assumption of the matriarchal nature of the homes from which these trainees come. This was particularly clear in the identification questions, where we find that the mother was much more often the more admired figure in the household, that large numbers of the men trainees felt they "take after" the mother rather than the father, and where even in the case where we coded two mentions and both the mother and the father could have been noted as important persons in one's life, the great majority of trainees did not mention the father at all even as a second choice. The issue is not the matriarchal nature of many of these homes. The issue is also not whether this factor helps explain some of

TABLE 46

Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Parents as Identification Figures

	Males				Females			
	I Lowest Earnings (N = 46)	II (N = 39)	III (N = 38)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 42)	I Lowest Earnings (N = 32)	II (N = 29)	III (N = 32)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 32)
People Mentioned by Trainees as "Person in Life Most Important to Them" (First two mentions)								
Mention mother and not father	59%	53%	55%	41%	79%	72%	59%	55%
Mention both mother and father	20	26	13	27	9	14	13	23
Mention father and not mother	4	0	3	10	3	0	9	6
Mention neither father nor mother	17	21	29	22	9	14	19	16
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Chi^2 = 7.203, 6 df*, p = NS				Chi^2 = 5.592, 6 df*, p = NS			
Parent that Trainees Admire More								
Father or father substitute	5%	23%	27%	25%	16%	18%	24%	23%
Mother or mother substitute	68	48	55	44	56	68	52	50
Equally	27	29	18	31	28	14	24	27
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Chi^2 = 11.470, 6 df, p = .10				Chi^2 = 4.1465, 6 df, p = NS			
Parent that Trainees Feel They "Take After" More								
Father or father substitute	46%	42%	42%	50%	28%	39%	32%	42%
Mother or mother substitute	49	35	36	36	60	48	60	38
Equally or neither	5	23	22	14	12	13	8	20
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Chi^2 = 8.007, 6 df, p = NS				Chi^2 = 7.814, 6 df, p = NS			

*Both categories involving mention of father were combined in computing the Chi^2 test.

the other differences between this group and more privileged segments of our society. Rather, the issue we are concerned with is whether the differences *within* our population on this dimension are related to job earnings in this population. Although stating the question this way makes it more limited, it may be more relevant to the issue of what should be done to help the people in the population represented in our study. One of the proposals that has come from the discussion around the Moynihan Report, for example, would be to change the welfare payments system in such a way as to encourage fathers to remain in rather than to leave the home. Such a proposal is based on the assumption that *within this population* the presence or absence of the father makes a difference.

There are many ways in which the presence of a father can make a significant difference and it is not the purpose of this report to negate its importance to a growing child for many areas of the child's development in life. We are concerned in this report only with the issue of achievement and, even more specifically, achievement in the job world. Therefore, the question posed by our lack of findings in this area is whether just the presence or absence of a father in the home in this population is relevant to a person's later achievement in the job world. A similar question was raised with reference to educational achievement by the Coleman report on equality of educational opportunity (Coleman, 1966). That report suggested that presence or absence of the father in the home was not relevant to the educational achievement of the Negro children.

The issue, as has often been noted, is not just the presence or absence of a male figure in the home, but the type of model that this figure represents. When the father, though present, has himself a low achievement role in our society, he does not necessarily present a positive and effective achievement model for his children. In the achievement area, mere presence or absence of a father may, therefore, have relatively little to do with what happens to the growing child. Changing the situation so that fathers more often remain in the home may not necessarily affect the child's development in the achievement area, unless the father is also given a job that is positive and meaningful.

A certain amount of irresponsible discussion has following the publication of the Moynihan Report and we would certainly not want to add to it. Particularly, we would not presume that the few findings we have presented in Tables 45 and 46 offer any definitive answers to the questions raised by this issue. However, these findings do help point up the complexities that are involved when one attempts to trace the influence of family organization and disorganization on the later behavior of the children who came out of those backgrounds. The findings underscore the importance, when one looks at these influences, of thinking differentially for different areas of the child's development. The effects or lack of effects that family disorganization has on the development in the achievement area may be very different from the effects in other important areas of social and personal development. Hopefully, then, the data we have presented may help underscore the complexities of the issues that are involved and counteract what has been one of the major problems in the debate over the Moynihan report, namely, the simplistic assumptions and arguments often presented by both sides to the controversy.

Summary

In contrast to the usual tendency to view the trainees in these youth programs as homogeneous in social background characteristics, the findings presented in this chapter have pointed to the fact that significant variation does exist and that this variation is related to trainee success, particularly as measured by job earnings after leaving the training program.

The factors related to earnings suggest that post-program job behavior is both continuous with trainee behavior patterns established before entering the program and reflective of contemporaneous forces and pressures on the trainee. The continuity with historical patterns is suggested by the findings which indicate that trainees with higher earnings tended to be those with a pre-program history of at least some minimal regularity of employment, that post-program earnings were positively related to the years of education the trainee had achieved before entering the program, and that (for the men trainees) those with higher earnings came from families where a larger proportion of the men were employed.

The evidence of the impact of contemporaneous pressures comes from the findings relating earnings to age and the family responsibilities associated with age. Among the men trainees, those in their late teens had lower earnings than did those in their early twenties. Men trainees with less earnings were also more often unmarried and living at home, with a parent the main source of familial support. Thus, for the men, earnings seem to have been clearly related to the pressures to work that come with increased familial responsibilities. Among the women, these relationships did not occur since the pressure to work that may come with increased responsibilities for women is balanced by the difficulties that these responsibilities bring. Thus, for women, the one clearly significant finding in this area was that women with lower earnings were much more often those who had two or more children.

In general, these relationships between background characteristics and trainee success were much less clear with dropout-placement than with earnings as the criterion. Among the men trainees there was some indication that dropouts tended to be younger and with a less regular previous job history, but they were not different from the graduating groups in family responsibilities and pressures. Dropouts among the men trainees also were not lower than the graduates in educational attainment; if anything, it was one of the graduate groups, those trainees who were not placed on jobs immediately upon graduation, who were lowest in education. Among the women trainees, there was some tendency for dropouts to be older, with more family responsibilities and less education, but these differences were not consistent and significant in relation to both groups of program graduates. The fact that the findings were less striking for dropout-placement is consistent with the analyses of the preceding chapter which suggested that this is less meaningful than earnings as a "success" criterion.

The types of findings presented in this chapter help illuminate the nature of the problems that these trainees face. The relationships between earnings and age and family responsibilities among the men trainees suggest that the problem of teen-age unemployment among Negro males may lie more in the types of jobs available to them than in whether or not any jobs are available. The fact that education is related to income even within the restricted range of these variables among the trainees, underscores the effects of the educational handicap in this group. However, perhaps the major import of the data presented in this chapter comes not from any particular finding but rather from the totality of relationships. These indicate that the trainees are not a homogeneous mass, but vary in social and background characteristics, and that these variations - though small when compared to those in a cross-section of the population - are significantly related to their success in the job world. These findings underscore the need for people working in these programs to be sensitive and responsive to individual differences among the trainees and to avoid viewing them in a single mold.

CHAPTER V

Factors Related to Success: Attitudes and Motivations

From their inception the experimental and demonstration programs directed toward the problems of the "hard core" unemployed have taken a broad view of the problems faced by the people they have attempted to help. They have seen much of the problem as psychological and motivational and have structured the task of preparing these people for the world of work as involving basic attitudinal and behavioral socialization as well as skill and educational training. An underlying assumption of these programs has been that the world of work demands certain knowledge, attitudes and habits that are not available to the trainees in the milieu from which they come and that they have to be taught if they are to make an adequate occupational adjustment. This has been particularly true of programs like the JOBS-I Project which are devoted to the employment problems of inner-city minority youth.

This psychological and motivational emphasis has been present not only in the experimental and demonstration programs of the Labor Department but in other programs that have been directed to the problems of this population such as the Job Corps and community programs like the Mobilization for Youth. Not all projects have had the same degree of commitment to these psychological and motivational issues that is represented in the major investment in counseling that was part of the JOBS-I Project. But almost all have been concerned with these issues to some extent. The very use of the term "hard core" attests to the assumption that the nature of the problems of these youth goes beyond issues of skill, education or change in the opportunity structure.

However, to say that there are psychological and motivational problems by no means defines the nature of the problems. Much has been written on this issue and even a brief review of the literature presents a formidable, bewildering list of concepts that has been used to describe the psychological characteristics of the population that these youth represent.[1] The multiplicity of these views is reflected in the great diversity of activities that has characterized the socialization efforts of these poverty programs, the different activities reflecting different assumptions about the nature of the psychological problems.

---

[1] We are referring to the multiplicity of concepts that has been used even among those who have agreed that these populations present certain attitudinal and motivational problems. The diversity of approaches is further extended when we consider that many who have written about these problems have questioned whether people in poverty have any special motivational characteristics and have viewed their problems completely in terms of the opportunity structure and other situational factors. In addition, there is another orientation to these problems, one which does recognize differences among the values and motivations of different socioeconomic class groupings but sees the characteristics of the poverty group in positive rather than negative terms, as strengths rather than problems, as health rather than pathology. An interesting characterization of these different perspectives and a discussion of their possible implications for action is presented in a recent paper by Rainwater (1969).

These varying assumptions and practices have often occurred within the confines of a single program. In the JOBS-I Project, for example, the specific activities devoted to socialization issues ran the gamut from lessons in personal grooming to practice in filling out application forms, to role playing on how to conduct oneself on a job, to attempts to instill positive attitudes toward work and appropriate habits of work discipline, to somewhat vague and ill-defined attempts at broad, general value socialization.

A multiplicity of concepts and approaches is not necessarily bad since these problems do not reflect a "single" psychological issue and there is no one "correct" remedial approach. Rainwater (1969), in his review of the varying perspectives on the problems of poverty populations, has noted that all probably represent partial truths and there is a certain amount of danger in oversimplifying the issues by casting them in "either-or" terms. However, in the case of the poverty programs, the multiplicity of approaches has to some extent reflected confusion and uncertainty as to the nature of the underlying problems these programs were attempting to deal with. Poverty programs have perhaps been unjustly criticized for this uncertainty and lack of consistent direction, since the confusion exists in the body of literature that the people running these programs have been able to draw upon.

It is obvious that the complex issues involved in this area cannot be answered in a single study, particularly one which, like the study that is the subject of this report, itself began with many of the confusions current in this area. Hopefully, however, the discussion in this chapter may at least help to clarify some of the issues involved.

Since this research study represented a very early approach in this area, we cast a broad exploratory net rather than focusing on one specific issue in our analyses of the motivations and attitudes of the trainees. We obtained measures on the trainees' vocational and general life aspirations, on their values regarding the world of work, on general values relevant to "Protestant ethic" or "middle-class" ideology particularly with respect to conceptions of what makes for success in life. We were concerned with issues of powerlessness and competence, the feelings about one's ability to control one's destiny. We were concerned with the general issue of self-esteem viewed from several perspectives: positive and negative self-concepts, motivations for self-actualization and self-development, attitudes toward the self as a Negro and the issue of self-hatred.

Almost all of our measures in the attitudinal and motivational domain showed no relationships with our two success criteria. To some extent this may reflect the preliminary nature of our study and the rudimentary quality of our instruments. However, this lack of relationship may also reflect the complexity of the motivational issues involved and the ambiguity of their relevance to issues like dropout or job earnings. Although we will not catalog the long list of negative findings in the body of this chapter, the fact of these negative findings should be kept in mind as backdrop for the discussion of the following pages.

Although we were concerned with a large number of specific variables and dimensions in the motivational and attitudinal domain, we have organized them within a limited number of theoretical frameworks. Two of these were of particular relevance in this study in that they represent general issues that underlie many of the specific variables of concern in this area. These might be labeled the issue of means or ends and the issue of internal-external control.

In the remainder of this chapter we will discuss the particular variables explored within these two frameworks, their relationships to the two success criteria and their general relevance to the motivational and psychological problems presented by the trainees.

The Means-Ends Issue

One of the major differences in the perspectives with which theoreticians and practitioners have approached the motivational and psychological issues in populations such as those served by the JOBS-I Project may be summarized somewhat over simply as follows: are the motivational problems ones of lacking "middle-class" dispositions and values, or are the issues ones of powerlessness, of feeling that one cannot implement one's values? One can speak of a person as having motivational "problems" if he lacks the goals and aspirations that most people in the society desire and if he does not share the dominant societal beliefs and values about what it takes to attain these goals. On the other hand, one can find problems of low motivation and demoralization among people who share the societal aspirations and values but who see very little possibility in their own situation of attaining these goals and implementing the values.

These two approaches are not necessarily contradictory in any sense but they do represent different foci and emphases and have very different implications for approaches one should take in attempting to deal with these problems. These two approaches to the motivations and attitudes of disadvantaged populations have both received a great deal of attention in the sociological and psychological literature. The vast literature on differences between middle-class and working-class populations is particularly relevant and, historically, shows an interesting shift between the two points of view. In the past the studies in this area tended to emphasize social class differences in basic values and personality dispositions and traced these differences to early socialization patterns set down in the family and parent-child relationships. It might be noted that this description of social class differences was not always necessarily painted in terms that disparaged the less socioeconomically advantaged. Indeed, the reverse was often true, with the anxiety-driven middle-class life compared unfavorably with the more "natural" working-class life. Regardless of the particular value connotation, however, the emphasis was on differences in aspirations, values and basic approaches to the world.

In contrast to the emphases of a generation ago, current writings and studies have increasingly come to view the motivational issues in disadvantaged groups as not so much a problem of basic dispositions and values as a problem of the inability to implement these values. For example, a major focus in the poverty literature these days in on the concept of powerlessness which points not to lack of appropriate values and aspirations in the poor but rather to their inability to achieve their aspirations and the frustration that comes from the disparity between aspirations and the ability to implement them. We see this emphasis in the very general day-to-day discussions of these issues which refer, for example, to the outbreaks in the ghettoes as problems of "rising expectations" and unfulfilled hopes rather than as problems of people with different hopes and aspirations than those of the mainstream in our society. We also see it increasingly in the more theoretical writings and research in this area. For example, in the famous Coleman report on "Equality of Educational Opportunity," the critical psychological variable that was most related to Negro elementary and high school students' educational achievement was a measure of the sense of effectiveness and control over one's destiny (Coleman, 1966).[2]

This changing emphasis from a focus on basic personality dispositions and values to one that stresses a sense of effectiveness or powerlessness can be seen not only in the increased attention given to particular concepts but also in reinterpretations of some old concepts. The "delayed gratification" construct presents a rather striking example of this. A large literature over the past 20 years has focused on differences in future-oriented behaviors of people from different socioeconomic groupings with those in lower groupings supposedly more oriented toward immediate gratification and less ready to postpone this gratification for later rewards. Traditional discussions of these supposed class differences viewed them as differences in a basic personality disposition; people wrote of the "inability" to delay gratification as a disposition set down in the early socialization of lower-class children. The discussions tended to ignore such an obvious issue as class differences in the attainability of the goals for which gratification was being deferred. Traditional approaches to the delayed gratification construct overlooked the very obvious point that people might be less willing to delay the gratification when the payoffs for the delay were very tenuous (Miller, et al, 1965).

Some (although not all) of the current discussion and writings on this construct are much more sensitive to the obvious relationship between delay of gratification and the possibility of attaining rewards for the delay. The work of Mischel is particularly interesting in the sense that it traces this historical trend away from the more traditional dispositional approach, in a series of studies on delayed gratification behavior over the past decade. In his first work in this area, Mischel was interested in the effects on delayed gratification of early familial socializing influences, focusing particularly on the effects of growing up without a father in the home (Mischel, 1961). In his latest work, however, Mischel focuses much more on issues of expectancies and payoffs for the delay for which gratification is being deferred. His current experiments are concerned with such issues as the child's trust that the experimenter will give the rewards for which gratification is being deferred, the success and failure experiences of the individual that affect his confidence that he can attain the gratification for which reward is being delayed, etc (Mischel and Staub, 1965; Mischel and Grusec, 1967).

Perhaps the clearest statement of what we have been describing as the more current point of view has come from the studies of Hylan Lewis on the Negro lower class in Washington, D. C. These studies have explicitly taken issue with the view that these people are different in "personality" or values, and have seen their problems strictly in terms of effectiveness and powerlessness. In Hylan Lewis' words, the problems are "due less to lack of recognition of and affirmation of so-called middle-class values than they are to lack of the wherewithal to support these values" (Lewis, 1967). A particularly eloquent statement of this approach appears in Elliot Liebow's Tally's Corner, the report of the intensive anthropological study that was part of Lewis' research (Liebow, 1966).

---

[2] The sense of control is also beginning to figure prominently in the work on early cognitive development of lower-class children. Hess (1969), for example, has stressed the significance of the mother's feeling of control over the world in affecting the way she teaches her children how to perceive and handle problem-solving situations. The mother's perception of her environment as manageable and controllable rather than chaotic and random has a critical influence on the child's cognitive development.

> The street corner man does not appear as a carrier of an independent cultural tradition. His behavior appears not so much as a way of realizing the distinctive goals and values of his own subculture, or of conforming to its models, but rather as his way of trying to achieve many of the goals and values of the larger society, of failing to do this, and of concealing his failure from others and from himself as best he can.
>
> If, in the course of concealing his failure, or of concealing his fear of even trying, he pretends - through the device of public fictions - that he did not want these things in the first place and claims that he has all along been responding to a different set of rules and prizes, we do not do him or ourselves any good by accepting this claim at face value.
>
> Such a frame of reference, I believe, can bring into clearer focus the practical points of leverage for social change in this area. We do not have to see the problem in terms of breaking into a puncture proof circle, of trying to change values, of disrupting the lines of communication between parent and child so that parents cannot make children in their own image, thereby transmitting their culture inexorably, ad infinitum. No doubt, each generation does provide role models for each succeeding one. Of much greater importance for the possibilities of change, however, is the fact that many similarities between the lower-class Negro father and son (or mother and daughter) do not result from "cultural transmission" but from the fact that the son goes out and independently experiences the same failures, in the same areas, and for much the same reasons as his father. What appears as a dynamic, self-sustaining cultural process is, in part at least, a relatively simple piece of social machinery which turns out, in rather mechanical fashion, independently produced look-alikes. The problem is how to change the conditions which, by guaranteeing failure, cause the son to be made in the image of the father. (pp. 222-223)

It is interesting to note and perhaps no coincidence that this increasing theoretical concern with issues of powerlessness and effectiveness has occurred during the time that poverty has become an increasing social concern and the energies of the nation have turned toward doing something about it. If we are trying to devise programs to deal with "hard core" problems, it is discouraging to view these problems as ones of dispositions and values derived from early socialization. Theoretically, problems of discouragement and sense of powerlessness can be more affected by the environmental and educational influences that these programs can bring to bear than can the dispositions and values formed in early childhood years.

One final comment is relevant. Although there has been this historical trend from an almost exclusive focus on values and personality dispositions formed in the early socialization within the family to a greater recognition of motivational problems that reflect situational and opportunity limitations, it should be stressed that this issue is by no means a dead one. The publication of the Moynihan Report and the spirited discussion around it indicates that there is still a significant controversy between proponents of these two approaches. The work of Oscar Lewis and others who have written on the "culture of poverty" reflects the fact that many still view the psychological issues in poverty from a perspective of cultural distinctiveness.

That the issue presented by the contrast of these two perspectives is still very current is illustrated rather dramatically in a recent report in the Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences on a continuing Seminar on Poverty that was organized by the Academy in 1966. Under the chairmanship of Daniel Patrick Moynihan, the seminar met over an eighteen-month period, bringing together social scientists and people involved in developing and administering the federal antipoverty program (AAAS, 1968).

> As Chairman of the Seminar on Poverty, Mr. Moynihan chose to report to the Academy on the present state of the discussion, following some eighteen months of intense consideration of a problem which, on balance, turned out to be much more complicated than many of the participants had originally thought. When the seminar first met, the members were confident that they could proceed directly to a consideration of how greater progress might be made in attacking the problems of poverty, only to find that, in actual fact, there was no shared judgment as to the true meaning of poverty itself. This was something of a revelation. Throughout the past year, the seminar has spent virtually all of its time sorting out the whole range of opinion on what constitutes poverty and what can be done about it.
>
> Within the group a spectrum of opinion has developed concerning the nature of poverty. If there is a tendency toward polarization in these opinions, it may be illustrated by that well-known exchange between Hemingway and Fitzgerald about the rich. On the one hand, there are the Fitzgeralds who say that the poor are different from us; on the other, the Hemingways who respond, "Yes, they have less money." Mr. Moynihan explained that at this point in the dialogue the participants have only defined the range of possibilities, and there is no way of knowing which possibility is the correct one, given the existing data.

Given the exploratory nature and the limitations of our study of the JOBS-I Project, it cannot be expected to provide the definitive data that Moynihan notes are not now available to provide answers to the issue we have been discussing. The findings we will now turn to should, therefore, be viewed as tentative and suggestive; hopefully the next few years will see much more definitive research devoted to this distinction between the two perspectives to the problems of poverty, as well as to the other questions in this area.

The Study Findings

This distinction then was one of the major frameworks within which we approached the investigation of the motivational and attitudinal issues relevant in this population. These two approaches are not mutually exclusive and we expect that both have meaning and relevance to some extent. However, the findings from this study provide more support for one of these perspectives. The study data highlight the motivational problems that spring not from lack of aspirations or "inappropriate" values, but rather from discouragement about the possibility of realizing these aspirations and implementing these values.

The findings from two different sets of questions in the questionnaires dramatize this point. One set of seven questions was taken in somewhat modified form from the items in Rotter's "Internal-External" Scale (Rotter, 1966). The items in this scale may be viewed as measuring the extent to which a person shares the "middle-class" values and beliefs about what it takes to do well in life, the belief that success comes from "internal" factors like ability and hard work and taking fate in one's own hands rather than from "external" circumstances like "luck" or "getting the breaks." Each of these seven questions presented the trainee with two sentences and asked him to pick the one which best represented the way "things actually are in life." In all of these about 70 to 80 percent of the trainees tended to choose the "internal" sentence. For example, they tended to choose "The unhappy things that happen to people come from the mistakes they make" rather than "Many of the unhappy things in peoples' lives are partly due to bad luck"; they tended to choose "A person becomes a success in life because he works hard; luck or getting the breaks has little or nothing to do with it" rather than "Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time."

The questions in the internal-external scale are phrased in a very general sense getting at the trainees' general values and beliefs rather than his personal experience. In another set of items in our questionnaire, the "Personal Efficacy" Scale, the trainee was asked to choose from pairs of statements very similar in content to the Rotter items, except that they focused not on abstract beliefs but on the trainee's feelings about his ability to handle things in his own life experience. Here we find that the trainees chose the "personal efficacy" sentence in only about 50 percent of the cases or less. For example, only about 35 percent checked the alternative "When I make plans ahead I usually get to carry things out the way I expected" in contrast to the 65 percent choosing "Things usually come up to make me change my plans." In short, in an abstract and general sense most trainees felt that success depended on planning and hard work, but they less often felt that they could really control their own fate.

Evidence that the trainees have to a large extent internalized the general societal values and aspirations appeared in their responses to many of the questions in the questionnaires and interviews, including a number that were more indirect and less obvious than the questions from the Rotter scale. One particularly significant example was the trainees' responses to a series of questions that asked them to comment on problems of unemployment and why people have trouble getting jobs. In their responses, trainees much more often blamed the unemployed person than the situation that he faced, usually by blaming lack of skill and education but sometimes by speaking of the unemployed person's low motivation or unwillingness to work hard; only about one trainee in ten blamed the lack of jobs, bad luck or racial discrimination.

One cannot, of course, automatically accept questionnaire and interview responses at face value. There is always the issue of how honestly the interviewee responds to a question, the extent to which he gives the interviewer what he feels is the appropriate or "socially desirable" answer, the extent to which, even if he is responding honestly in his own mind, his response represents a superficial stereotype that does not reflect his "real" feelings or values and attitudes.[3] There is no ultimate answer to such questions, of course, except to attempt to tap these attitudes and values, as we have done in this study, in a wide variety of ways, in interviews as well as questionnaires, in indirect as well as direct questions.

---

[3] Many who have questioned whether lower-class people are giving meaningful and honest responses when they subscribe to middle-class values and aspirations,

One point, however, can be made. Any of the criticisms that one could apply to the questions that attempted to tap the trainees' general values and beliefs should also be applicable to the personal efficacy questions. For example, there is no reason to have expected that people would more readily give "honest" answers to questions about their own feelings of inadequacy and lack of control than they would to very generalized questions getting at values and attitudes about the "American dream." The fact that in response to very parallel sets of questions the trainess tended to question themselves and their ability to control their world more than they questioned standard American values, suggests that this difference may be a meaningful one and not a mere artifact of the interview process.

One final comment is relevant. It is possible that the trainees in this project represent a very special population. They are, after all, people who volunteered to participate in a program that appealed to their desire for their share of society's goals and to values of work and self-help to achieve these goals. Their voluntary participation in these programs suggests that their motivational problems cannot be explained away as a rejection of white middle-class goals and values.

At any rate, for the purposes of this study, the crucial issue is not how many trainees responded in a particular way on a given attitudinal question or set of questions. Of greater significance is the relationship between their attitudinal responses and the two criteria of success that we have investigated in this study. In this connection, the findings most relevant to the distinction we have drawn between values and efficacy are presented in Tables 47 and 48. These tables present the relationship of dropout-placement and post-program earnings to the trainees' responses to five attitudinal scales measured in the post-program questionnaires and interviews.[4] One of these scales, the "Personal Efficacy" Scale gets at the issue of effectiveness (or its obverse, powerlessness). The other four scales tap the more generalized values and beliefs.

---

have pointed to the ways in which their behavior does not reflect these values. This begs the question, however, since whether or not one acts accordingly depends not only on holding certain values and aspirations but on feeling that one's actions can gain these goals and implement these values. Lack of achievement-oriented behavior can reflect discouragement about one's ability to attain achievement goals as much as a rejection of these goals.

[4] Because the largest number of cases was obtained in the post-training interview, these tables present the data relating the success criteria to attitudes and motives expressed in this last interview. This obviously raises a question in cases where we find a relationship between job success and a particular attitude or motive, namely, whether the attitude or motive preceded and is, therefore, predictive of success, or whether it is a consequence of it. Therefore, when such a relationship does appear, we will also then examine the relationship between job success and responses to the same attitudinal scale expressed in the earlier questionnaires and interviews.

The first two scales in Tables 47 and 48 - "work investment" and "desire for positive job payoffs" - refer to the trainees' orientations toward work. They were derived from the trainees' responses to a question phrased as follows: "Different people want different things from a job. In the list below we've written down some of the things that might be important." Following this question a list of 13 items appeared, suggesting the types of qualities a person could seek in a job. The respondent answered on a four-point scale ranging from "very important for me" to "not important for me." The trainees' responses to this question formed two clusters of items which became the two scales presented in Tables 47 and 48. The "work investment" scale consists of seven items that suggest a limited investment in one's job, items such as "a job where I don't have to work too hard," "a clean job where I don't get dirty," "a job that leaves me a lot of free time to do what I want to do," etc. The other six items formed the cluster that we have labeled "desire for positive job payoffs." In these items, the job is viewed as a potential for fulfilling aspirations and achievement needs, for example, "a job where I can learn new things, new skills." Thus, together, the two scales indicate the extent to which the trainee approaches his job with an achievement or a nonachievement orientation.

The next two scales in the tables attempt to measure these "Protestant ethic" values in a more general way. They emerged as separate factors in a factor analysis of a larger number of items presumed to tap this general area. The "Protestant Ethic Value" scale consists of four items utilizing the following format: the respondent was given a short description of two people and was asked to check on a five-point scale whether he saw himself as "I'm like A," "I'm more like A than like B," "I'm halfway between A and B," "I'm more like B than like A," or "I'm like B." For example, one of the items included in this scale was the following:

A. Person A believes in living for today. He thinks you ought to enjoy yourself while you have a chance and forget about tomorrow.
B. Person B thinks a lot about the future and tries to plan ahead. A lot of times this means that he gives up today's fun and enjoyment.

Other items in this scale contrast the value that people should work hard with the belief that "you're a sucker if you work harder than you have to," juxtapose a willingness to accept welfare with the value that it's better to have a job even if you don't get more money than you'll get from welfare, etc.

The "Protestant Ethic Belief" Scale is very similar to the "Protestant Ethic Value" Scale. It included four items utilizing the same five-point "I'm like A" format and two of the forced-choice items from the Rotter "Internal-External" Scale. Most of the items had the common theme of contrasting a belief that hard work makes for success in life with the belief that other factors are more relevant to success. For example, one of the Rotter forced-choice items was worded as follows:

A. People get ahead by their own hard work.
B. Lucky breaks or help from other people are more important than hard work in deciding whether a person will get ahead.

One of the five-point items in this index was the following:

A. Person A feels it's his own fault that he's had trouble getting a job. If he had tried harder he probably could have gotten one.
B. Person B doesn't think he is to blame for not being able to get a job. The way things are it wouldn't matter how hard he looked.

The content and meaning of the items in the "Protestant Ethic Value" scale and the "Protestant Ethic Belief" scale overlap considerably. To some extent the items in the value scale are phrased more in terms of what the person believes "should" be, whereas the items in the belief scale are more often phrased in terms of what "is" (hence, the distinction between "value" and "belief"). However, this distinction does not run consistently throughout the items. The fact that the two factors emerged in the factor analysis may reflect no more than an order effect. In one scale the "Protestant ethic" end of the scale was always the second item, while in the other scale it was the first item. The distinction between the two scales, therefore, may represent a methodological artifact and both scales might be viewed as measuring essentially the same type of attitude and belief.

The Personal Efficacy scale was adapted from a scale that has been used in many studies at the Survey Research Center over the past ten years. As we have indicated, it is very different from the other four scales presented in Tables 47 and 48. The questions in this scale ask the trainees not about general abstract values and ideologies but what actually happens in their own lives, not what generally makes for control in life but what control they themselves feel they have over their own lives.

The scale consists of the following five forced-choice items:

1. A. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
   B. It is not always a good idea to plan too far ahead, because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad luck anyway.

2. A. I've usually felt pretty sure my life would work out the way I want it to.
   B. There have been times when I haven't been very sure that my life would work out the way I want it to.

3. A. When people disagree with me, I sometimes start to wonder whether I'm right.
   B. I nearly always feel sure of myself, even when people disagree with me.

4. A. I often have trouble making up my mind about important decisions.
   B. I don't have much trouble making up my mind about important decisions.

5. A. When I make plans ahead, I usually get to carry things out the way I expected.
   B. Things usually come up to make me change my plans.

Turning now to the findings presented in Table 47, we note that none of these five scales related to the first criterion of success, the tendency for the trainee to drop out of the program or graduate with an early job placement. The findings on post-program earnings presented in Table 48 also showed no consistent relationships, with one striking exception: among the male trainees, there was a very clear and significant relationship between the sense of personal efficacy and the trainee's job success. This finding is perhaps even more

TABLE 47

Relation of Dropout-Placement to Trainees' "Middle Class" Attitudes

	Males			Females		
	I Dropouts (N = 43)	II Late or Nonplaced Graduates (N = 30)	III Early Placed Graduates (N = 92)	I Dropouts (N = 56)	II Late or Nonplaced Graduates (N = 20)	III Early Placed Graduates (N = 53)
Means on Work Investment: Scale from 7 (lowest work investment) to 28 (most work investment)	19.98	19.07 All NS	19.48	20.75	21.05 All NS	20.62
Means on Desire for Positive Job Payoffs: Scale from 6 (most desire) to 22 (least desire)	8.68	9.22 All NS	8.29	8.60	8.05 All NS	8.33
Means on Personal Efficacy: Scale from 0 (lowest efficacy) to 5 (most efficacy)	2.17	2.11 All NS	2.47	1.94	2.30 All NS	2.08
Means on Protestant Ethic Values: Scale from 5 (least acceptance) to 20 (most acceptance)	16.08	14.89 All NS	15.58	15.68	16.20 All NS	15.67
Means on Protestant Ethic Beliefs: Scale from 8 (most acceptance) to 28 (least acceptance)	15.25	15.67 All NS	15.24	14.49	14.75 All NS	15.27

TABLE 48

Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Trainees' "Middle Class" Attitudes

	Males				Females			
	I Lowest Earnings (N = 39)	II (N = 36)	III (N = 35)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 34)	I Lowest Earnings (N = 33)	II (N = 23)	III (N = 27)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 29)
Means on Work Investment: Scale from 7 (lowest work investment) to 28 (most work investment)	19.14	18.86	19.42	20.12	21.39	21.23	20.04	20.45
	All NS				All NS			
Means on Desire for Positive Job Payoffs: Scale from 6 (most desire) to 22 (least desire)	8.97	8.23	8.09	8.48	8.73	7.95	8.62	8.17
	All NS				All NS			
Means on Personal Efficacy: Scale from 0 (lowest efficacy) to 5 (most efficacy)	1.92	2.11	2.58	2.85	1.94	1.86	2.40	2.29
	I vs III,** II vs IV,** I vs IV*				All NS			
Means on Protestant Ethic Values: Scale from 5 (least acceptance) to 20 (most acceptance)	15.57	15.34	15.53	15.47	15.48	16.90	15.44	16.11
	All NS				I vs II***			
Means on Protestant Ethic Beliefs: Scale from 8 (most acceptance) to 28 (least acceptance)	15.50	15.78	14.62	15.87	15.06	14.68	14.88	14.38
	All NS				All NS			

Significance levels: * .01
** .05
*** .10
NS Not significant
All comparisons not indicated in the table were not significant.

striking if we express it somewhat differently in terms of the percentage of trainees making an above average score (a score of 3, 4 or 5) on the efficacy scale: whereas only 19 percent of the male trainees in the lowest earnings quartile had a score of 3 or higher on the efficacy scale, this was true of 36 percent of the men in the second lowest quartile, 48 percent of the men in the next quartile, and 63 percent of those in the highest quartile. These findings highlight the significance of issues of control and powerlessness in the motivational dynamics of these trainees, rather than issues of more generalized values and beliefs.

Some note might be made of the findings on the relationship between personal efficacy and job earnings among the women trainees. As indicated in Table 48, there was some indication of a positive relationship, but it was not statistically significant or consistent across all four earnings quartiles. Apparently, personal efficacy was less relevant to the success of the women than of the men trainees.

To some extent this difference between the men and women trainees is similar to the findings reported in the preceding chapter where we noted that the relationship between educational achievement and earnings was less striking for the women than for the men (Table 42). Again this may reflect the fact that wage rates were significantly lower for women than men, that there was, thus, less potential reward and payoff for the most effective women. On the other hand, the findings may also reflect the fact that the issue of competence and control is more crucial for men than women, that a man's success depends more on his active coping, and that passivity is less detrimental to a woman's achievement than it is to a man's.

As we have noted, the data in Table 48 relate to attitudes measured at the time of the post-training interview, that is, after not before the trainees' experience in the job market. There are two possible explanations for this relationship, therefore. On the one hand, it could indicate that people with a greater sense of efficacy and control over their destinies would be more able to go out into the job market and be relatively successful within it. On the other hand, we could hypothesize that job success is the "independent" variable, that a greater feeling of control and efficacy follows an individual's more positive experiences in the job world.

Since we had a longitudinal design and measured personal efficacy (as well as the other attitudes) at all the stages of our research, we were able to test these two hypotheses about the meaning of the relationship between efficacy and job success. Table 49 presents the correlations which indicate the relationship between post-program earnings and the sense of personal efficacy as measured before the men trainees went into the job world. The table presents two correlations: one is the relationship with personal efficacy measured in the middle of the program, a few months before the trainees went into the job world; the other is with personal efficacy measured at the end of the program, more immediately before the entry into the job market.[5]

---

[5] We present these relationships in the form of correlations rather than mean differences between the four earnings quartiles because the number of cases is much smaller than in our analyses of the data from the post-training interviews. As indicated in Table 49, only 87 of the men trainees on whom we had post-program earnings data also had personal efficacy data from the mid-program questionnaire

There is some tendency indicated in Table 49 for sense of personal efficacy to be related to earnings in a predictive sense, particularly if we consider efficacy as measured immediately before entry into the job market, which represents the most appropriate measure for the predictive hypothesis. The correlation between earnings and efficacy measured at the end of the program is +.22. While not statistically significant with an N of only 54, it does suggest some tendency for men with a higher sense of personal efficacy while still in the program to be more likely to attain relatively greater success in the job market after they leave the program.

TABLE 49

Correlations Between Personal Efficacy During the Training Program and Post-Program Earnings: For Male Trainees

	Correlations	N
Personal Efficacy Measured at Mid-program	+.11*	87
Personal Efficacy Measured at End of Program	+.22*	54

*p = NS

The fact that personal efficacy may predict job success does not eliminate the possibility that personal efficacy may also be a *consequence* of job success. Therefore, one final question remains. Given that there is some tendency for a predictive relationship between efficacy and job success, is there also evidence that a greater sense of efficacy follows a more successful experience in the job world?

Statistically, we can answer this question with the technique of partial correlation in which job success is correlated with personal efficacy measured in the post-project interview, partialing out the individual's personal efficacy score obtained at the time he was still in the program. Essentially these partial correlations indicate how much of the relationship between job success and personal efficacy as measured in the final interview *cannot* be attributed to the trainee's feelings of efficacy before he entered the post-program job world. These partial correlations, then, give some indication of the extent to which feelings of efficacy might be viewed as a concomitent and *consequence* of the job world experience rather than a predictor of it.

These partial correlations are presented in Table 50. Again, we take our data from both the mid-program and end-of-program questionnaires. The relationships presented in the table are clear. Controlling on the attitudes expressed

---

and interview administration and only 54 had data from the administration at the end of the program. These Ns are too small to permit the type of quartile comparison that has been made in this report.

while in the program, there is still a significant relationship between personal efficacy and post-program earnings.[6]

TABLE 50

Correlations Between Post-Program Earnings and Personal Efficacy in the Post-Program Period: Partialing out the Effects of Personal Efficacy During the Program (For Male Trainees)

	Correlations	N
Personal efficacy in mid-program partialed out	+.43*	111
Personal efficacy at end of program partialed out	+.25**	64

*p = .01
**p = .05

Thus, there is some evidence that, for the men trainees, the relationship between personal efficacy and job success may be a circular and mutually reinforcing one. There was some tendency for people who entered the job market with a feeling of some control over their destiny to do better than those who approached it with a sense of fatalism and powerlessness. There was even clearer evidence, however, that this experience of job success fed back into and reinforced these very same attitudes that had helped to bring it about.

The fact that the trainees' feelings of competence and efficacy seem to be clearly affected by their experience in the job world is a finding that we wish particularly to underscore. As we have indicated in our discussion in this chapter, many of the approaches to the motivational and attitudinal problems in "hard core" groups have assumed that these problems reflect deep personality pathologies that are residues of the trainees' disadvantaged past, that remain largely self-reinforcing and self-perpetuating and unaffected by the present realities. It is important, therefore, to recognize that in many instances, trainees' problems in attitudes and motivations might be more meaningfully viewed as understandable reactions to present situational realities. We stressed this same point previously in our discussion in Chapter II in our comments on the finding that the tendency to get discouraged and drop out of the program occurred more frequently within the OJT sections where the skill-training aspect of the program never developed adequately. Other findings that we have noted in the course of this report also point to the reality basis of the trainees' reactions; for example, the very striking relationship berween the trainee's family responsibilities and his motivation to get and keep a job.

---

[6] In computing the partial correlations presented in Table 50, the formula proposed by Bereiter was utilized. This formula includes a correction for unreliability of the attitude measure to avoid a spuriously high relationship that would be due to the error component that is common to both time periods. Reliabilities were estimated using the Spearman-Brown formula and based on item intercorrelations.

It should once more be cautioned that in stressing the reality basis of many of the motivational problems expressed by the trainees, in pointing to situation-tied concepts like effectiveness and powerlessness rather than differences in values, we are not suggesting that there are no motivational problems in poverty groups that might not be viewed meaningfully in other ways. Certainly the fact that the findings were negative in the few simple approaches that we utilized in the study to measure problems that spring from a rejection of "middle-class" goals and values, cannot be taken as definitive evidence that there are no such issues when dealing with the motivational and psychological correlates of poverty. In turning to the possible implications of the study findings, therefore, we do not mean to imply that the suggestions offered would solve all motivational problems or would be relevant for all of the people served by these programs. Hopefully, however, they do address themselves to some of the particularly significant issues.

Implications

What are the implications of the psychological and motivational issues that we have been discussing? Particularly, what are the implications of the point of view that stresses that the motivational problems of these trainees are tied to the reality problems facing them?

Perhaps the most serious and basic question that this orientation poses relates to the underlying assumption of many of the programs for the "hard core" unemployed that one can deal effectively with these issues in an isolated special program devoted to their problems as individuals - their attitudes, training and education - separated from any systematic attempt to affect the opportunity structure that the trainees face in the world outside the program. When we look at the literature on poverty, particularly with respect to Negro populations, we find a very striking dichotomy of approaches. One approach stresses the social and institutional aspects of the problem; the other approach, while not denying the original social causes, is mainly concerned with the resultant individual damage and pathology - the lack of education and skills, the motivational pathologies. One approach calls for change in the social structure and basic institutional arrangements; the other focuses on attempts to help the individual - through educational, vocational and motivational training - to find a more rewarding place within the existing structure.

What we have been arguing in the discussion in this chapter is that we cannot really separate the motivational and reality aspects of the problems that these trainees face, for their motivation is directly tied to the question of the reality payoffs available to them. This may seem a rather obvious point; we stress it because programs devoted to the hard-core unemployed have in fact many times tended to keep the issues separate. This was particularly true several years ago when these programs were first beginning and when the notion of the pathological nature of the motivational problems tended to predominate. With this as the dominant perspective, many programs focused so much on the educational and motivational problems that the issues of skill competence and provision of jobs were often neglected. We have already noted that this was true in the JOBS-I program, where in some aspects of the programs skill training was minimal, where even when skill training was provided the skills were usually not utilized in the jobs the trainees received upon leaving the program, where there was very little follow-up provided by the program as the trainees left the project and went out into the job world. This tendency of the early programs to focus on motivational issues isolated from reality problems was scathingly indicted several years ago by Cloward and Ontell (1965) who were conducting the research on the effects of the Mobilization for Youth program:

> One runs the grave risk of seeming to be ridiculous by calling attention to the possibility that there may be a relationship between the way in which a young person performs in a training program and his expectation that a job does or does not await him on graduation. If it is ridiculous, so be it, for the plain fact is that we act as if the relationship does not exist.

This was probably an over-statement of the case even when it was made several years ago, but it did reflect a tendency for the programs to assume that meaningful jobs were readily available, that there were meaningful niches in which their trainees could be placed if they could be made ready for them. Essentially, the early projects operated as crash programs, lasting from a few months to a year, providing some minimal help and training on the implicit assumption that this might be the crucial influence necessary to pull the trainees out of their rut and despair and get them started toward a meaningful place in the job world. The problems tended to be viewed as "in" the trainees, in their inadequate educational and vocational skills and attitudes and behavior patterns that were dysfunctional for the occupational world.

In the past few years, the history of programs devoted to the problems of the hard-core unemployed has reflected a gradually increasing recognition of the relationship between problems of trainee motivation and the actual payoffs available to the trainees in the real world. In contrast with those of several years ago, programs today tend to be much more actively concerned with attempts to articulate the program with the job market. There is increasing concern not only with obtaining jobs for the trainees but with the type of job that might be obtained, jobs that have some skill requirements and mobility possibilities and do not represent the dead end of unskilled labor. To the extent that the programs maintain a large investment in counseling, there is more emphasis on counseling the trainees out in the job world where the motivational issues can be dealt with around the actual reality problems they are facing, as opposed to the type of approach exemplified in the JOBS-I project where the counselors focused their efforts within the project, with the implicit assumption that the trainees' motivational problems represented general attitudinal and behavioral characteristics that could be dealt with in an isolated semi-therapeutic situation.

The greater sensitivity to the tie between motivation and reality payoffs is also evident in the fact that increasingly programs are not just passively attempting to fit trainees into existing niches, but are more actively getting involved in job development, in helping create and develop the kinds of opportunities that will provide a meaningful place for their trainees. There is increasing recognition that it is not enough just to help trainees find available jobs. Many of the problems these programs have faced reflect the fact that for the product of the typical program for hard-core unemployed very little is available, certainly very few jobs with upward mobility possibilities. Perhaps the most striking example of this concern with job development appears in the concept of "New Careers for the Poor" which suggests that the poor could be trained for a vast number of subprofessional jobs in the health, education and welfare programs that communities are undertaking in carrying out the mandate of the Economic Opportunity Act (Pearl and Riessman, 1965). But other programs have become concerned with job development on a scale somewhat less ambitious than that.

Perhaps, then, the major implication of the perspective within which we have viewed the motivational problems of these trainees is to underscore the importance of continuing a number of the directions in which we have tended to go in moving away from the motivational approach represented in programs on the model of the JOBS-I project. It might be noted, incidentally, that many of these developments have been adopted by the JOBS project itself in the years that followed the first attempt that we studied. Better articulation with the job world, including active attempts at developing meaningful job opportunities; the training of skills with expanding mobility possibilities; the utilization of counselors in the actual job setting dealing with motivational problems as they arise around the job rather than as "socializers" within the isolated therapeutic setting of the project - all of these are developments which follow from a greater awareness that motivational problems cannot be divorced from the question of reality payoffs.

It should be stressed that these recent developments we have noted are by no means universally accepted in the approaches to the problems of the hard-core unemployed. For example, in a recent discussion of the Job Corps that appeared in the Saturday Review, the following quote from the director of one of the camps indicates that many still approach the motivational issues in the model of the JOBS-I Project (Schrag, 1968).

> "We're in the business of changing attitudes," said William F. Grady, Kilmer's deputy director for program, "and don't let them tell you otherwise." As a consequence, Kilmer and other centers have become examples of one of the most unusual social enterprises ever attempted in America. The Job Corps is an institutional attempt to move society's losers into the middle class. "There's a motto in the Job Corps," the new arrivals are told at an orientation meeting: "to learn, to earn, and to work." Much of the Job Corps, finally, is pure Horatio Alger . . . .
>
> But shop work, no matter how it builds confidence, is not as crucial at Kilmer as the program called Guided Group Interaction (GGI), the daily meeting conducted in each of the dormitories. GGI is part discipline ("social control"), part morale booster, and, though not so intended, part therapy. Formally GGI is described as an effort to use peer group influence to build responsibility - the responsibility each man must assume for himself and for the group.

Thus, in urging a priority for meaningful jobs and skill training and questioning the value of motivational approaches that focus on socialization in the isolated project setting, we are not merely echoing developments that are by now universally accepted in these projects. The issues we have been discussing are still the subject of active controversy.

To summarize, then, our concern with the reality bases of the motivational problems has led us first to a consideration of the reality situation that these trainees face and to recommendations devoted to dealing with these reality issues. We have high-lighted the reality aspects of these problems not only because these were most clearly demonstrated in our research findings, but also because we feel it is crucial to do as much as possible in the reality area before looking for "deeper" psychological explanations. This is important as a matter of public policy since a tendency to look for problems in the trainees, to blame the people, can sometimes be too easy a rationalization for our inability to come to grips with the tremendous reality issues that these problems pose. But beyond this it is also important for theoretical reasons to keep a reality perspective as one views these motivational problems. It is very difficult to determine the import of deeper psychological and attitudinal problems when the reality situation presents tremendous obstacles. When these programs really come to grips with reality issues, really provide meaningful skills and opportunities and trainees still fail, one can then get a better picture and understanding of the other psychological and attitudinal problems. It is difficult and premature to do so, however, at the present stage of our dealing with these problems. Both on policy and theoretical grounds, therefore, we would give priority to the particular perspective toward motivation that we have stressed in this discussion.

In a sense, this focus on the reality basis of the trainees' problems might seem a strange conclusion to a study conducted by social psychologists, designed to investigate the motivational issues that these populations present. Ultimately, the problems posed by the realities these trainees face are beyond the competence of social psychologists to solve. This does not mean, however, that this is all that can be said about the motivational issues. For although the motivational problems are affected by the immediate reality situation that these people face, there is more to the motivational problem than that. We have commented that those who have stressed the motivational and psychological issues presented by these trainees have tended to neglect the reality and institutional problems. In a similar vein, those who have approached the problem of poverty with suggestions for changes in social institutions and the opportunity structure have tended to ignore the fact that motivational problems will not automatically disappear with these structural changes. Just as a concern with motivational issues does not necessarily imply a neglect of reality, a concern with reality does not mean that motivational and personality issues are irrelevant.

Thus, the perspective that views these trainees' motivational problems in relation to their reality opportunity situation does not deny the importance of psychological issues. Rather, what it suggests is a focus on different types of psychological issues than those that have been emphasized by people who have adopted a more traditional and individually oriented psychological perspective. The type of psychological issues that become relevant under a reality orientation are those that we have stressed in the discussion in this chapter - issues of competence, efficacy and powerlessness, feelings about one's ability to affect one's life. And problems remain even when opportunity and situational factors change because, particularly for a group of people with a history of failure and defeat, self-confidence does not automatically increase with an increase in competence and increased feelings that one can control one's fate do not automatically follow an increase in the objective realities that this is indeed the case. Even in a situation of objectively expanding opportunities, we expect that a significant relearning task will have to be accomplished so that the subjective realities for these trainees will conform to the present rather than the past objective realities.[7]

---

[7] Essentially, we are attempting to resolve the usual dichotomy between psychological and situational approaches by focusing on the types of psychological issues that follow from an appreciation of situational and opportunity constraints. It might be noted that some theoreticians who have looked at these problems from a cultural perspective are attempting a parallel resolution between

It may be helpful in the attempt to understand the nature of these motivational issues and their implications for job training programs to relate our discussion to some of the recent work in the general psychological literature on motivation theory. Of particular relevance is the concept of expectancy that has been central in the motivational theories of people like Atkinson (1964) and Rotter (1954) who have followed some of the earlier work of Lewin and Tolman. These theorists have stressed that the motivation of any given behavior depends not only on a generalized disposition to approach or avoid a given class of objects - the motive to use Atkinson's terminology - and the incentive value of the particular goal or object at issue, but also on the expectancy or person's estimate of the probability that this behavior will lead to the goal. Our stress on the concept of efficacy has pointed up the expectancy aspect of motivation since feelings of competence and efficacy are a major determinant of a positive expectancy, i.e., of the feeling that the probabilities are high that one's behavior can implement one's goals. Translated into these motivational terms, what we have stressed in our discussion is that without necessarily denying that some of the motivational problems among these trainees may come from a low achievement motive or the rejection of some of the achievement goals and incentives in our society, a major issue is also their problems of expectancy - the motivational problems that come not from a lack of desire for societal goals, but from the feeling that they have little chance of attaining these goals.

The significance of the expectancy construct is that it integrates the individual and situational approaches to these trainees' problems, which, as we have noted, have often been seen as pointing in divergent directions. Expectancies are affected by the immediate objective situational payoffs and are thus subject to change as these situational opportunities change. However, expectancies also represent the residues of the history of the individual's past experiences with success and failure and thus influence the way he will react to the realities he faces and even to changes in these realities. Because the determinants of expectancies lie in the past as well as the present, increased subjective probability of success does not automatically follow an increase in objective probabilities. Even in a situation where opportunities are expanding rapidly, some motivational relearning is necessary to change expectancies so that they conform to the present rather than the old realities.

Thus, the problems of these trainees follow from the fact that expectancy is to some extent a generalized disposition that develops like other personality dispositions out of the whole life history of relevant success and failure experiences and that affects the specific subjective expentancies that will be perceived in any particular situation. When we view expectancy in these general dispositional terms, it presents problems of resocialization and relearning as

---

what has usually been viewed as contrasting cultural and situational approaches. Their discussion of the "culture of poverty" focuses on subcultural differences between poverty and other groups - but on differences that represent subcultural adaptations to an environment of constraints and limitations. Thus, they view the environmental constraints as critical, but also recognize that these subcultural adaptations that have served the test of time and history will not automatically change with environmental change, particularly with environmental manipulations imposed from outside. Rainwater is a prominent proponent of this point of view.

serious as those of other personality dispositions. People with low expectancies of success like the hard-core unemployed, will not automatically change these expectancies when their reality situations suddenly change. Cast in these terms, the problem, once we have improved and expanded the reality opportunities, becomes one of getting the trainee's expectancies of success (his confidence, sense of efficacy, etc) to reflect the new opportunities. Thus, the critical issues of motivational theory that are relevant to these training programs are those that have to do with the learning of new expectancies and the generalization of this learning so that it can be transferred from the learning situation in the training program to the world outside the program. In the following section we will look at some of the literature on expectancy that is relevant to the issue of the relearning and generalizing of expectancies and the implications of these findings for job training programs.

The Implications of the Literature on Expectancy

It is interesting when we turn for help to the motivational literature that relatively little has been done by the major motivational theorists on the learning and transferring of expectancies. In the work of McClelland, Atkinson and their associates, the major focus has been on the determinants of the motive disposition, not on expectancy. In their experiments, expectancies have typically been experimentally manipulated as a means of comparing reactions - particularly the risk-taking preferences - of people differing in motive strength. This experimental focus is a reflection of their theoretical orientation which traditionally has seen the motive as a relatively general and stable personality disposition and the expectancy as specific and situationally determined. It is only in the later work within the McClelland-Atkinson tradition, particularly the work of Veroff (1965) and Feather (1966, 1968), that expectancy has been viewed as a more general disposition with the problems of resocialization and relearning that are characteristic of other personality dispositions.[8] Thus, the work that is most relevant to our discussion comes from theorists who have worked outside this major motivational tradition.

The one group of motivational theorists that has addressed itself systematically to the issue we are discussing consists of Rotter and his associates (Rotter, 1966). As we have indicated in previous sections of this chapter, the Rotter group has been particularly concerned with the question of the bases of expectancy - specifically whether expectancies are seen as deriving from internal or external control of reinforcement - and the relationship of this to problems of learning and generalizing new expectancies. Because of the interest in the content of the internal-external construct and its relation to issues of efficacy and powerlessness, it has usually been forgotten that Rotter's interest in this variable sprang not from this substantive concern but rather from his theoretical interests in the question of how one learns new expectancies. Looking at this internal-external concept both as a characteristic of a situation and as a personality orientation, Rotter and his associates have shown that where causality is seen as external - that is, as based on chance forces over which the individual has no control rather than on the person's own internal resources of ability, skill and effort - one learns less predictably from reinforcement. They have shown that people in experimental situations ruled by chance rather than skill, as well as people who show a disposition to view the world in external terms, are less guided by their experiences of success and failure in learning new expectancies and in generalizing this learning to new situations (Bennion, 1961; James, 1957; James and Rotter, 1958; Phares, 1957; Rotter, et al, 1961). This is understandable in simple common-sense terms. If a person feels that his success or failure in a given situation is determined by chance rather than by his own skill and resources, there is no reason for him to utilize this experience as a basis for evaluating future similar situations.

---

[8] It is interesting that in distinguishing between the situationally determined expectancy and the motive disposition set down in the early childhood development, the traditional McClelland-Atkinson approach parallels the traditional approaches to poverty and social class differences which, as we have already noted, also separated situational and "personality" determinants. It is also interesting that the McClelland-Atkinson concentration on the motive disposition and its determinants in early childhood experiences, parallels the tendency for the class and poverty literature of the past generation to focus on the personality and value issues supposedly derived from early socialization experiences, rather than on those problems most reflective of on-going situational limitations. In a similar vein, the motivational theorists' growing interest in the construct of expectancy parallels the increasing interest in the poverty literature in constructs like "efficacy" and "powerlessness."

These studies are particularly relevant to our discussion because they focus on a problem that evidence suggests is particularly critical in the groups usually served by these training programs. The research on internal-external control has consistently demonstrated class and racial differences in the degree to which individuals feel they control the reinforcements they receive. Lower socioeconomic groups are more likely to feel that external rather than internal factors operate to control what happens to them in life. Furthermore, the interaction of class and race is such that lower-class Negroes stand out as having a particularly external orientation, one which is understandable in terms of their life experiences (Battle and Rotter, 1963; Coleman, et al, 1966; Lefcourt, 1966). These class and race findings have appeared in studies of all ages - children, adolescents and adults. Thus, in pointing to the particular problems in learning expectancies that occur among people with an external orientation, Rotter and his associates have underscored a problem that is likely to be particularly relevant in the groups served by these training programs.

What are the implications of these findings? If we are concerned with helping the trainee tie his expectancies to his internal resources and control, the success experiences that the trainees have in the course of their training should be tied to their actual performance. This means a programming of the tasks in such a way that easy steps come first and trainees learn both skills and expectancies as they proceed through the tasks. And it is crucial that their competencies and skills are seen by the trainees as the phenomena that produced their successes so that they develop a well-internalized sense of control, one that is not so easily deflated by subsequent failure experiences.

Once more, then, we underscore the importance of training in competence and skill, not only to help the trainees with some of their "objective" problems, but as a cornerstone of the approach to their psychological and motivational problems as well. Acquiring competence in a meaningful skill is an essential underpinning for any long-range stable change in their feelings about their opportunities in the occupational world.

We have already indicated how this rather obvious point has sometimes been neglected in these programs' concern with socialization issues. Rotter's findings on the implications of an external orientation point up not only the ineffectiveness of a program that focuses too much on socialization issues but suggests its possible boomerang effects as well. Programs like the JOBS-I Project place a great deal of emphasis on teaching behaviors that are deemed to be essential if one is to get along and be acceptable in the world of work. There is a great deal of concern in these programs with such issues as grooming, dress, how to behave with one's supervisor, how to take exams that are used in job selection. While such emphases can be helpful, there is a potential danger in them, particularly if they occur in programs where they overshadow the emphasis on skill and competence. To focus on such strategies of manipulation and accommodation to outside forces may encourage the very external orientation that is an important aspect of the problem that these trainees present.

It is important to underscore the significance of skill training not only for those approaches which have focused too much on socialization issues; these days, it is perhaps even more important to stress it with those programs which, in a reaction against the earlier approaches, now focus on getting trainees immediately into the job world. There is an increasing emphasis on contemporary approaches on programs that get trainees immediately into the job world, with training and counseling services provided in the job setting. This approach has gained impetus with the involvement of major business corporations in these programs and the hope that getting people off the streets and into jobs may forestall violence and riots.

The principle of integrating the training and counseling around the job world is certainly one which we would not question, since it is consistent with a number of the findings and recommendations we have offered. The critical question about such programs, however, is whether in their focus on providing jobs they remain cognizant of the need for jobs with some mobility possibilities and make adequate provision for the skill training that these kinds of jobs require. We may refer again to the discussion in Chapter IV which suggested that Negro teen-age unemployment is not due to the unavailability of any jobs, but of jobs with some skill and mobility possibilities. A rush to provide jobs, if these jobs do not provide some meaningful skill training and mobility possibilities, will undoubtedly not be effective, neither for the immediate objective of forestalling outbreaks and violence, nor as a way of addressing the long-range problems of people like these trainees.

We have noted that, except for this work done by Rotter and his associates, systematic motivational studies on the expectancy issues we have discussed are still in their beginning stages. However, some of the tentative generalizations from these studies are relevant. Of particular interest are the studies that have dealt with two issues: the stability of newly learned expectancies and the factors related to this stability; and the generalization of newly acquired expectancies.

Our interest in stability is obvious, since in a training program we are not interested in developing new expectancies that have little stability over time or that need constant reinforcement to maintain. Rather, we are hopeful of effecting more permanent change. The studies on expectancy in the literature are rather pessimistic on this point, since they indicate that changes produced by success and failure in specific experimental tasks may be quite transitory. Studies have indicated that in as short a time period as one day after the experimental learning situation, there is a considerable reversal among subjects back to the expectancies they held before the experiment (Phares, 1966; Rychlak

3

and Eacker, 1962; Schwarz, 1966). There is also evidence in these same studies that reversals are more likely to occur when the expectancy training was highly discrepant with the person's initial level of expectancy (Schwarz, 1966). For example, among the people who began with very low expectancies, a striking and consistent set of success experiences in the experimental situation could lead to great heightening of expectancy at the end of the experiment but would have little long-range permanent effect; there would be a greater tendency to revert back to the low expectancy when the subjects were tested again some time after the experiment.

These findings are particularly relevant since we would expect our trainees to be people with low expectancies. For such people the study findings imply that the training situation should give them enough success experience to provide some basis for a change in their orientation, but not so much success that the whole training experience becomes divorced from reality and has a minimal impact beyond the period of the training program.

In addition to the question of stability of learning, the expectancy studies raise the issue of when newly acquired expectancies in a specific situation will affect the more generalized disposition regarding one's chances for success. Just as we are hopeful of promoting more permanent change, we are also crucially interested in training that will transfer beyond the specific training situation. We are interested in providing a set of training experiences that will help the trainees develop a general sense of effectiveness with which to meet the challenges that they face outside the training program.

Although the studies are not clear on this issue, there are some data that are particularly relevant because they refer to people of low expectancies. The findings of several studies suggest that people with low expectancies are particularly "situation-bound." They are very easily affected by the success and failure experiences in a given situation and very easily generalize to new situations (Crandall, 1963; Crandall, et al, 1964; Mischel and Staub, 1965). However, this very same situational sensitivity makes them unusually sensitive as well to the success and failure experiences that they then meet in the next situation. For people with low general expectancies, the unusually heightened expectancies that follow successes are easily deflated by later failures.

These findings are particularly relevant to the issue of the generalizability from the project to the post-project world. It is essential that the training be of such a nature that it helps the trainee handle the realities of the job world. Providing a completely supportive environment in the project might help keep the trainee from dropping out but would not prepare him to handle the realities of the job world. Again, the tying of success (and failure) experiences to actual skill and performance in the training period is helpful on this issue. To the extent that the reinforcement experiences in the training program follow a reality-based pattern of successes and failures, there is a greater possibility for learning that can handle the realities that will be faced after the end of the program.

To deal with the issue of generalizability, then, we return to a comment made frequently in this report, that it is important to increase the connectedness between the project and the job world. To some extent this means making the environment of the training project resemble as much as possible that of the job world. We have suggested that one important aspect of this environment is one where experiences of success and failure are tied realistically to skill and performance. There are many other ways in which this realism and comparability of the two environments could be encouraged. For example, when many of the issues of confidence and efficacy among Negroes occur in relation to whites, we may question how much a Negro trainee may be expected to transfer the heightened confidence and expectancy built up in a training program, when the training program consists of all Negro trainees as was true in JOBS-I, and the job setting is an integrated one.

More important perhaps than attempts to make the training and job situations parallel are those recommendations that tend to break down the separation between the job and project worlds. The problem of generalizability that we have been discussing is probably best handled by the directions many recent programs have taken where counseling and education and vocational training occur not in an isolated program but are carried out in an actual job setting. In terms of the psychological issues that have been the concern of this chapter, we wish particularly to support the value of transferring the counseling emphasis from one of preparatory socialization in an encapsulated project setting, to one that concentrates on working with the trainee around the problems that arise in the actual work world. The psychological problems of confidence, expectancy, anxiety that we have stressed will be critically faced in the job world, and it is there that counselors might more effectively focus their efforts.

We might note in this connection that the need for such counseling in most cases will likely extend beyond the few months period around the beginning of the trainee's first job. The problems around learning new expectancies are very difficult ones and the trainees' feelings of confidence are likely to remain fragile and easily deflated for a long period of time, even following a number of success experiences. It is likely that to be maximally effective, the counseling relationships established with the trainees should be maintained over a long period of time.

In summary, our review of the expectancy findings has suggested certain self-reinforcing aspects of the expectancy problems of the trainees. Low and externally based expectancies are less easily modifiable in any long-range stable sense, despite changes in the objective probability situation. A major task, we have indicated, is to break into the circle, to take a population that is highly sensitive to the immediate situation, and help them develop the inner resources and confidence so that they are less immediately modifiable by subsequent negative experiences. We have offered two types of suggestions to deal with these issues: that the training and counseling be more clearly integrated with the reality issues that the trainee will actually face in the job world; and that training should attempt to tie the trainees' success to their skill and competence and performance.

A cautionary note is important at this point. Making the training "realistic" is not always synonymous with pointing up the skill-based nature of successes and failures. The nature of the world we live in is such, particularly for these trainees, that rewards do not always follow performance. A training program oriented to the proposition that all situations are skill-based and that success is only a matter of learning new skills would not be a training completely adequate for the realities that these trainees face. In some sense, then, expectancy training should include teaching about the way the social system operates. In some way trainees should be helped to distinguish whether a particular situation is skill-based or externally-based, whether a particular failure ought to reduce their internally-based expectancies or not. This raises some questions about complications in the internal-external control area that are usually not considered in the traditional research that pairs skill and chance factors, but which are likely to be highly important in a population that faces a variety of external obstacles other than chance. We will discuss some of these complications in the following section.

The Issue of Internal-External Control

We have already noted the prominance of the internal-external control dimension in the work of many people studying the problems of poverty groups. In contemporary writings it has become fairly common to view the motivational problems of poverty populations as deriving from feelings of powerlessness in confronting an environment viewed as bewildering and uncontrollable. Despite all the writings and research with this construct, however, and despite the fact that conceptually it seems to represent a rather simple common-sense notion, it presents a number of complexities that have usually been ignored, but that are important to the issues of concern in this report.

One of the complexities springs from the fact that the writings in this area have implicitly assumed that a belief in internal control represents a feeling of competence, efficacy and control over one's own fate. We have already indicated that this is not necessarily true, that a belief that internal control operates generally in society does not necessarily reflect a feeling of one's own ability to control and implement one's fate. There is another implicit assumption in the way an internal orientation has been viewed that should also be noted. It has usually been assumed that internal beliefs represent some kind of positive affirmation. What has been neglected in the literature is the fact that an internal orientation may also have negative implications. When associated with success, an internal orientation can lead to feelings of competence and efficacy. When associated with failure, however, it can lead to self-derogation and self-blame. Rotter, in a finding that has tended to be forgotten in our focus on the positive aspects of an internal orientation, noted that the relationship between the internal-external control dimension and personal adjustment tends to be somewhat curvilinear (Rotter, et al, 1962). Because of the potential intrapunitive implications of an internal orientation, people with an extreme internal orientation as well as those with an external one tend to be psychologically less adjusted and healthy. This is a particularly important consideration to keep in mind in dealing with the types of people that are likely to be represented in programs like the JOBS-I Project. For people who have a history of much failure and little success, and whose failures are tied to very real external obstacles they have faced, an internal orientation may be more reflective of intrapunitiveness than of efficacy. An internal response that might be considered "normal" in terms of the typical middle-class experience, may be extreme and intrapunitive in the light of the experiences of the people represented in the JOBS-I Project.

Thus, the implications of an internal or external orientation are complicated by the issue of the reality bases of the obstacles the individual has faced. This points to a complexity on the "external" end of the continuum that has not usually been considered in discussions of this dimension. Almost all of the research on internal and external bases of expectancy has examined just two bases - skill versus chance. The experimental studies have varied characteristics of the situation to produce the perception that success and failure are the result of either skill or chance, and the personality measure of internal-external control developed by Rotter and his associates required the individual to choose between two explanations for success and failure - an "internal" explanation asserting that what happens in life is the result of the person's skill, ability or effort, and an "external" explanation asserting that success and failure are determined by fate or chance. These may be the most pertinent bases for people whose advantaged position in the social structure limits the operation of other external determinants of success and failure. But low income groups experience many external obstacles that have nothing to do with chance; for instance, the operation of the labor market which can lead to layoffs over which individuals have no control. There are class-tied obstacles to all kinds of opportunities and to resources which open up other opportunities, which may be correctly perceived by low income persons as external but not a matter of randomness or luck. For low income Negroes there is also the external factor of racial discrimination that operates over and above class obstacles. It may be perceived as operating quite the opposite of chance - systematically, predictably, reliably.

This distinction on the external side is not just an esoteric issue. We suspect that it matters motivationally for disadvantaged groups whether one talks about chance or about some of these other external factors. Although the literature to date indicates that people who believe in internal control are more guided by reality cues in learning new expectancies, are generally more effectively motivated, and perform better in achievement situations, these same effects may not follow for low income persons, particularly Negroes, who believe that skill factors are always more important than economic and discriminatory factors in explaining why they succeed or fail. Indeed, a focus on external factors may be motivationally healthy instead of damaging when it concerns assessing one's probabilities for success against systematic and real external obstacles rather than exigencies of fate.

To some extent these considerations may help explain why we found no relationship between our measures of generalized Protestant Ethic beliefs and the two success criteria in our study. For the trainees to hold such beliefs despite their history of failure in the face of many reality obstacles may imply an intrapunitiveness and lack of realism that counterbalances any of the possible positive motivational implications that might come from holding such beliefs.

We attempted to get at some of these issues in a number of questions in the questionnaires and interviews. The most directly relevant was a question in the interviews in which the interviewer read a list of things "that some people feel have kept them from doing as well as they might have done in life" and asked the trainee to rate how important he felt each one had been in keeping him from doing as well as he might have done. The list of items included both types of external factors that we have noted: chance factors ("bad health or accidents" and "bad luck") as well as racial discrimination. It also included different types of internal factors that might be used to explain one's failure: those which implied some motivational deficiency in the trainee ("got good breaks but did not use them" and "laziness") as well as those which focused on lack of competence and skill ("not enough ability" and "not enough training and education").

Table 51 presents the relationship between the responses to this question on blame attribution and the first success criterion, dropout-placement. Table 51 indicates a number of interesting relationships for the men trainees. Among the men, a high internal orientation in interpreting the determinants of one's problems was associated with failure, not with success. The group that was least successful by our criterion, that is, those men trainees who stayed till the end

TABLE 51

Relation of Dropout-Placement to Blame Attribution by Trainees

Factors Trainee Feels Have Kept Him From Doing as Well as he Might Have (Means on four-point scales with 1 representing trainee's view that the factor was "very important")	Males I Dropouts (N = 43)	 II Late or Nonplaced Graduates (N = 30)	 III Early Placed Graduates (N = 92)	Females I Dropouts (N = 56)	 II Late or Nonplaced Graduates (N = 20)	 III Early Placed Graduates (N = 53)
Bad health or accidents	3.63	3.46 All NS	3.53	3.50	3.40 All NS	3.58
Bad luck	3.10	2.92 All NS	3.01	3.26	3.00 All NS	3.46
Got good breaks but did not use them	2.61	2.54 All NS	2.74	2.96	2.95 All NS	3.08
Laziness	3.15	2.62 II vs I,*** III***	3.21	3.44	3.35 All NS	3.33
Not enough ability	2.78	1.88 II vs I,* III*	2.61	2.53	2.85 All NS	2.73
Not enough training and education	1.83	1.35 II vs I,** III***	1.98	2.02	2.45 All NS	2.27
Discrimination	3.34	3.15 III vs I,* II***	2.77	3.04	3.15 All NS	3.00

Significance levels:
* .01
** .05
*** .10
All comparisons not indicated in the table were not significant.

of the program but were not placed by the project staff immediately, did not blame luck or accidents or discrimination. They blamed their own inadequacy. They questioned their ability, they felt they had not had enough training and education and they even questioned their own motivation ("laziness") more than did either of the other two groups, those who graduated from the program and were placed immediately as well as those who dropped out of the program before graduation.

The meaning of these findings is undoubtedly complex, particularly if one attempts to impute causality and direction to the relationships. They cannot, of course, be taken as an indication that an internal self-blaming orientation "causes" failure since the greater self-blame in the later-placed group was to some extent probably a reaction to their failure. It will also be recalled that this group had less education and scored lower on achievement tests[9] so that their greater sense of inadequacy with respect to ability and education was to some extent a reflection of reality. The complexities of the interrelationships, however, do not negate the finding itself which is that self-blame rather than external blame was associated with this failure, that an internal orientation when it involved self-questioning rather than competence was clearly not associated with success.

The Table 51 findings on the tendency to blame racial discrimination for one's failures are also of interest in connection with the distinction we have drawn between "reality" and "chance" bases of an external orientation. Among the men trainees it was the most successful ones, those who graduated from the program and were immediately placed on jobs, who most often attributed their failures to racial discrimination. This is not surprising given the fact that discrimination is a reality that has affected all these ghetto youth. A sensitivity to the realities of one's problems is a necessary prerequisite for effective coping with these problems.

In summary, the findings in Table 51 are consistent with some of the issues we have raised in our discussion of the internal-external dimension. An internal orientation, when it focuses on self-blame, can be associated with negative rather than positive consequences, and a focus on external factors, when it represents real external obstacles these trainees have faced, can reflect a healthy sensitivity to the realities of the world they have to deal with.

The findings are less clear in Table 52, which presents the relationship between the question on blame-attribution and the second criterion of success, post-program earnings. Here, again, we find a number of significant relationships among the men trainees but they do not form any clear pattern. If we look at those findings which showed a significant linear relationship with the earnings criterion,[10] the one generalization that appears is that those in the lower success groups seemed to blame more things. They more often focused on internal factors, particularly those relating to ability and education, but they also more often attributed their failures to "bad luck." Although in this latter instance the relationship did not go in a completely linear stepwise progression from the lowest to the highest success quartile, in general the men trainees in the lower two quartiles tended to mention "bad luck" more often than did those in the higher two quartiles. We did not, therefore, find the distinction between internal and external factors that was observed with respect to the dropout-placement criterion, where failure was associated with internal factors (self-blame) and success with blame of the system.[11]

---

[9] See Chapter IV, Tables 39 and 41.

[10] Two of the findings showed significant nonlinear relationships. These findings indicate a particular tendency for the second lowest earnings quartile group to focus on external factors - "bad health or accidents" and "discrimination." Although one might formulate some rationale for these findings, it is probably more appropriate to consider them chance results.

In our discussion of some of the complexities in the concept of internal-external control, we have raised more questions than we have been able to answer. The pursuance of these issues requires more systematic and relevant data than were available in this preliminary study. The issues are critical ones, however, for they have implications for the way we view the problems faced by these trainees and for the solutions we suggest. Most importantly, they serve to remind us that the type of program we are discussing in this report, one which focuses on an internal orientation and an individual bootstrap-lifting approach to these problems, is only one limited approach to these issues. It is limited by the possibility that this focus may lead to greater intrapunitiveness rather than competence and efficacy;[12] and even when it does increase individual competence and control, it is limited by the fact that it has not dealt with all of the determinants of the trainees' problems.

In a broad sense, then, the question raised by our discussion of the internal-external dimension relates to the limitations of any program which takes an individual approach to these issues. It is interesting in this connection to contrast the way the youth training programs have approached the problem of poverty with the way in which the other great social issue of our time has been approached. The civil rights movement has been very clearly directed toward an assault on the situational and institutional determinants of expectancies, calling for action against social and institutional barriers. By its nature, combatting these barriers has demanded group rather than individual action. Thus, in contrast to the individual self-betterment emphasis of programs like the JOBS-I

---

[11] Some note might be made of the male-female differences in Tables 51 and 52. The greater tendency toward intrapunitiveness among the men trainees who graduated without being placed may reflect the fact that failure in the job world is more a blow to the self-esteem of a man than a woman. A similar explanation may account for the fact that while there was a significant relationship between self-blame (regarding ability and training and education) and job earnings among the men, there was no significant relationship for the women trainees (although the women low earners, like the men, more often assigned the blame to "bad luck"). Again, as several times previously in this report, these findings suggest that some of the psychological achievement issues that distinguish the masculine and the feminine roles among middle-class white populations in our society apply to this "hard core" Negro population as well.

[12] This danger would be particularly an issue in programs that focus on socialization issues to the neglect of skill and competence training. To encourage the values and beliefs of an internally-oriented Protestant ethic without training in some of the skills that might help one implement these values, is potentially psychologically destructive.

TABLE 52

Relation of Post-Program Earnings to Blame Attribution by Trainees

Factors Trainee Feels Have Kept Him From Doing as Well as he Might Have (Means on four-point scales with 1 representing trainee's view that the factor was "very important")	Males				Females			
	I Lowest Earnings (N = 39)	II (N = 36)	III (N = 35)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 34)	I Lowest Earnings (N = 33)	II (N = 23)	III (N = 27)	IV Highest Earnings (N = 29)
Bad health or accidents	3.65	3.26	3.32	3.78	3.48	3.52	3.54	3.59
		I vs II,*** II vs IV**				All NS		
Bad luck	2.83	2.77	3.26	3.16	3.10	3.26	3.38	3.52
		I vs III,*** II vs III**				I vs IV***		
Got good breaks but did not use them	2.59	2.63	2.68	2.88	2.90	2.87	3.04	3.28
		All NS				All NS		
Laziness	3.08	2.94	3.35	3.25	3.19	3.30	3.54	3.59
		All NS				All NS		
Not enough ability	2.16	2.40	2.62	2.97	2.55	2.83	2.72	2.79
		I vs III,*** IV,* II vs IV**				All NS		
Not enough training and education	1.46	1.74	1.71	2.44	2.03	2.30	2.42	2.41
		IV vs I,* II,** III*				All NS		
Discrimination	3.27	2.60	2.88	3.13	2.77	3.00	3.27	2.93
		II vs I,** IV**				I vs III***		

Significance levels: * .01
** .05
*** .10
All comparisons not indicated in the table were not significant.

Project or any program which focuses on the vocational area, the civil rights movement has seen the solution to the motivational and reality problems of powerlessness in terms of group activity directed against the external sources of the problems.

It is interesting, in this connection, that there have been a number of attempts to bring this group-oriented focus to bear on the youth vocational projects in the poverty program. These approaches involve setting up vocational programs not as isolated units but as integral parts of broad community-wide programs attempting an integrated assault on many of the basic problems the communities face. Mobilization for Youth, Har-You and TWO are examples of broad community-wide action programs which include job training projects as one aspect of the many community problems with which they are concerned. This tendency to place job programs within a broad community group action context was intensified under the Economic Opportunity Act which called for community action programs with a maximum feasible participation of the poverty groups affected by the program.

The implications of our discussion of some of these internal-external issues, then, is to underscore the value of programs which attempt to combine the individual betterment and advancement orientation of the job training program with the group assault on the problem of powerlessness of the social actionists, tying the problem of individual mobility to the success with which the group attacks some of its external reality problems. To some extent, some of the questions we have raised in this section may serve as cautions and qualifications of the implications we noted in the previous section where we focused on individual-centered approaches to the issues of apathy and powerlessness. It is not that skill training and individual mobility are unimportant. Rather, what must be cautioned against is too exclusive a focus on such an orientation.

In conclusion, it should be stressed that the value of participation in group-oriented action against external obstacles is important not only because it helps to handle some of the real problems these trainees face in their environment. It is probably also important for the psychological and motivational health of these trainees as individuals. The problems of powerlessness among these hard-core Negro youth are so tied to their identity as Negroes that a focus on external as well as internal determinants and an encouragement of group as well as individual action, may be necessary to cope successfully with the problems. The rise of Black Nationalism and Black Power, and even to some extent the violence and riots, may attest to the desire and need among people like the trainees for a group approach to these issues. While the tide of recent events does not make an individual competence approach to these problems irrelevant, it should serve to place it in a proper perspective.

Summary

This chapter has explored some of the major issues that have been dominant in theoretical and practical attempts to understand and deal with the motivational problems of poverty populations. It has been particularly concerned with those issues that are highlighted by the tendency of approaches to these problems to polarize between those which see poverty groups as lacking some of the goals, aspirations and values of "middle-class" society and those which see their problems in terms of efficacy and powerlessness, the inability to implement these goals and values.

The findings presented in this chapter highlight the motivational problems of powerlessness rather than those of aspirations and values. The trainees indicated more doubts about their ability to control and effect their lives than they questioned the standard "Protestant Ethic" values. More significantly, the personal efficacy scale that measured this sense of effectiveness and control was the only measure of attitudes or values in the study that showed a clear consistent relationship with the job success criterion. For the men trainees the relationship was a striking one and apparently circular in nature. To some extent, the sense of personal efficacy measured at the time the trainee was still in the program, predicted his job earnings after leaving the program; there was an even more significant feedback effect, the trainee's job success affecting his feelings of efficacy.

This distinction between these two approaches to the problems of poverty is a crucial one for they constitute contrasting assumptions that underlie many of the variations in approaches to these problems that different programs have taken. The concern with problems of basic value orientations tends to find expression in the type of "resocializing" institutional program that was the object of this study. The focus of such programs is on "preparing" the individual trainee - vocationally, educationally and attitudinally - in a separated semi-therapeutic setting and then sending him into the occupational world. In contrast, the concern with problems of efficacy and powerlessness tends to find expression in programs that see motivational problems as much more clearly tied to on-going situational realities. These programs get more concerned with issues of job development and job placement and tend to focus their efforts - basic education and counseling as well as vocational training - in on-the-job settings. Although there has been a movement in the history of manpower programs over the past few years from those stressing resocialization and preparatory training in institutional settings to those focusing on on-the-job training with supportive services, manpower programs still represent all shadings of this spectrum, from the Job Corps on one extreme to the present-day JOBS Program (Job Opportunities in the Business Sector) on the other.

While recognizing that no single approach to the motivational problems of poverty represents "the" truth, and that the findings in this study are tentative and exploratory, the argument in this chapter has supported the approach that focuses on issues of powerlessness and efficacy and the program emphases that follow this orientation. Drawing on some of the psychological literature on motivation, particularly the work on "expectancy," this orientation to motivational problems has the following kinds of program implications: it highlights the importance of providing a meaningful job payoff for skill training and basic education, which underscores the significance of job placement and job development activities and which can probably better be accomplished in on-the-job settings; it suggests that it might be more useful to focus psychological and counseling efforts around the problems that occur in the period when the trainee is entering and adjusting to the job world, rather than around resocializing attempts to "prepare" him for that world; it points to the need for combining supportiveness with realism in the successes and failures that the trainee experiences in the training period, particularly that he see these successes and failures as tied to his own developing skills and competences. Thus, the program implications of an expectancy approach support a number of the emphases that have accompanied the shift in manpower programs from institutional "preparatory" projects to those focusing their efforts in on-the-job settings.

However, the motivational orientation adopted in this chapter also raises certain cautions for these more recent program approaches. It suggests that motivational problems of efficacy and expectancy, though different than problems of value socialization, are likely to be equally serious and resistant to change, often requiring long-term counseling efforts. The reaction against the resocializing approach to counseling should not obscure the recognition that a major investment and commitment is still required in the counseling area. Moreover, the emphasis in OJT-centered programs on providing trainees with a job should not obscure the fact that the need is not for "any" job but for jobs with meaningful skills and mobility possibilities.

In addition to the "value-efficacy" distinction, the chapter discussed another motivational issue that is relevant to some of the directions that manpower programs have taken. Questions were raised about the increasingly popular analysis that an "internal" orientation - the belief that success and failures in life follow from individual effort rather than external circumstance - is necessarily a positive motivating force for achievement and performance. It was pointed out that such an orientation among poverty populations, with a history of failure in the face of real external obstacles, may reflect an intrapunitiveness and lack of realism about the world they live in that can have negative implications for motivation and achievement. Data in this study relevant to this issue were tentative and exploratory but did suggest a relationship between the tendency to blame oneself rather than the social system for one's failure and the dropout-retention criterion: the least successful trainees, those who graduated from the program but were not immediately placed on a job tended to be self-blaming; those who graduated and were immediately placed more often blamed racial discrimination for their limited success.

This "internal-external" issue is significant because it points up some of the possible limitations of vocationally oriented programs that tend to focus on individual responsibility. That manpower programs have been concerned with this issue is reflected in the fact that a number of them have muted the completely individual focus by placing it within a broader group context, appealing to group as well as individual pride, encouraging individual mobility as part of the group's attack on its problems, focusing on reality problems in the environment as well as on self-improvement. Community-wide programs like Har You, TWO and Mobilization for Youth have tried to combine these individual and group emphases; more recent examples of such attempts are programs which attempt to utilize "group pride," such as Project PRIDE and Opportunities Industrialization Centers.

The exploration of motivational and attitudinal issues revealed some significant differences between the men and women trainees. The relationship between efficacy and job success was much clearer and significant for the men than the women. Moreover, the "failures" among the men - those who graduated without being placed and those who had lower post-program job earnings - tended to be more intrapunitive than the more successful trainees, whereas, no significant relationship between self-blame and the success criteria obtained for the women trainees. These findings are consistent with what one would expect in "middle-class" populations - that issues of competence and control are more critical for a man than a woman, and failure in the job world a greater blow to self-esteem.

CHAPTER VI

Summary and Implications

This is a report of a research study of the JOBS-I project, an experimental and demonstration job training project for approximately 1500 underemployed inner-city Negro youth. The project lasted from September of 1963 to the summer of 1964. It took a broad view of the trainees' problems and needs, and provided extensive basic education and group and personal counseling as well as vocational training. The project originally intended to provide the skill training in the institutional setting for one group of trainees, and in OJT placements for the others. However, the OJT placements did not materialize. This meant that all of the training and education took place in the institutional setting, in some instances including vocational education, in others (the "OJT" wing of the project) including only basic education and counseling.

The research was longitudinal in nature. Of the 339 trainees interviewed six to nine months after the termination of the project, all had received either questionnaires or interviews at one or more previous periods: at the time they entered the program, at some time during its course, or at the time of its termination. In addition to these interview data from the trainees, the research obtained interviews from the mothers of the trainees in the interview sample, the supervisors of the first jobs they went to after leaving the program, and the project administrators, teachers and counselors.

This research study was not an evaluation in the usual sense. There was no control group of comparable trainees who did not go through the program, and no attempt to estimate the "benefits" accruing from the program experience. The major focus of the study was on individual rather than program success. We have examined the characteristics, motivations and attitudes of the trainees and the relationship between these and two criteria of a trainee's success: whether he dropped out of the program or completed it and was placed on a job; and his job earnings in the period following his leaving the program. By exploring the trainee characteristics and attitudes that differentiated the more and less successful trainees, we have attempted to pinpoint the special problems that inner-city Negro youth face and draw possible implications for training programs that are attempting to deal with these problems.

A secondary focus of the study was more on the training program itself and reactions of the trainees to the different aspects of the program. Since this particular project had a very heavy investment in basic education and counseling as well as vocational training, it provided an opportunity to explore the meaningfulness of these types of program activities for the population represented by the trainees in this study.

Summaries of findings and implications have already been presented at the end of each chapter, and only the highlights will be noted at this point. Following the order of the presentation in this report, we will first comment on the different program activities, and then discuss the relationships between trainee characteristics and success. Finally, we will conclude by relating some of the implications of this study to directions manpower projects have taken in the past few years and to problems that might be particularly relevant in current program approaches.

Skill Training, Basic Education and Counseling

Skill Training

Skill training is clearly the most significant aspect of these manpower programs, even when heavy emphasis is placed on other things such as basic education and counseling. This was evident in a number of findings in the study. Trainees who were trained in skills that they used in later jobs saw this training as the major gain of the program. In the OJT wing of the project where no skill training actually became available to the trainees, motivation and attendance sharply decreased. Skill training is not only important because of its obvious economic relevance but for psychological reasons as well. The motivational problems that are critical among these trainees, problems of confidence and feelings of powerlessness, can best be helped by providing trainees with an underpinning of competence in a meaningful skill.

This seemingly obvious fact that training in a meaningful skill should be the basic element in these programs has sometimes been obscured by programs' concerns over other trainee needs, particularly for basic education and personal counseling. It is important to underscore that investment in these other areas, while important, should not occur at the expense of skill training.

Basic Education

The major problem in teaching basic education in these programs does not seem to be the negativism we might expect the trainees to have carried over from the dissatisfactions and frustrations most of them experienced in school. Trainees expressed very little resentment at the idea of "going back to school." Rather, when criticism was expressed against the basic education classes, it was usually that these classes were a "waste of time," that the trainees did not see them as relevant to their central concerns over getting a job. This underscores the necessity for basic education programs in these projects to focus around content that is clearly and obviously job-related.

Although job relevance is a special problem for basic education it is to some extent a general issue for all aspects of manpower programs, particularly for those occurring in institutional rather than on-the-job settings. This was indicated in the study data which showed that in the two or three months that expired between their entering the program and our second interview administration, there was a great increase in the trainees' feelings that they would leave the program if they had a good job alternative. It is particularly significant that there was no comparable increase in the amount of economic hardship the trainees experienced. The increasing pressure to leave the program for a job did not seem to reflect any growing sensitivity to their economic situation but rather a growing sense of purposelessness and questioning about what all of this was leading to. This was particularly obvious among the OJT trainees who were not getting any skill training at all, but it was evident even where vocational training was being provided in the institutional setting.

To some extent this problem of relevance will always be heightened in institutional programs, and is a major reason for the growing tendency to orient manpower programs around on-the-job settings. But sensitivity to this issue and a focusing on content that does have clear job relevance can mute the problem to a considerable extent.

Counseling

Counseling in the JOBS-I project was set up to serve a dual function. It had a formal aspect focusing around daily group sessions whose purpose was to "socialize" the trainees, to teach them some of the attitudes and behaviors necessary for adjustment in the world of work. Counseling also had a more personal informal purpose, to provide the trainees with a sympathetic, supportive person who could help them handle some of their individual anxieties and problems. To fulfill this dual purpose the project attempted to staff the counselor role with subprofessionals near to the trainees in age and social background (and, our findings indicate, also closer to the trainees in attitudes and values).

The study data indicate that the counselors' personal supportive function was much more significant than his socializing one. The responses of the trainees to the formal group counseling sessions tended to be relatively indifferent. Since the sessions did cover job-relevant material the problem of relevance did not arise as often as it did with the basic education classes, and the trainees rarely considered the counseling sessions a "waste of time"; but the trainees also did not consider them to be very important and rarely singled them out as the critical aspect of their project experience.

In contrast, the trainees had a very positive response to the counselors in their personal and supportive role. Counselors were more often singled out as the staff member "most important and helpful" to the trainees than were any of the other staff members, and it was as a person, as someone the trainee could take his problems to, not as a teacher or "socializer," that the counselor was reacted to in this way. Indicative of this difference between the importance of what the counselor was as a person and what he did and taught in a more formal sense are the findings which indicated that the trainees were much more attracted to the counselor than they were to the other two staff members but saw the counselor as less knowledgeable and less influential in the program as a whole.

These findings have obvious implications for the role of the counselor in projects such as these. They suggest that personal interest, sympathy and support may be more important than the more formal socializing function. These conclusions are further supported if we are correct in our analysis of the motivational problems of these trainees in which we have questioned whether the trainees' values represent the major motivational issue that should be of concern in these programs. There is the further point that value resocialization requires a professional therapeutic skill beyond that attained by the subprofessionals typically utilized in these counseling roles; a more limited focus on personal support is probably more appropriate to their level of skill and competence.

It should be noted that a shift in the counseling emphasis from preparatory socialization to personal support with ongoing anxieties and problems is consonant with the shift in manpower programs from institutional to on-the-job settings. An institutional setting is more appropriate for handling socialization issues than the types of tensions and anxieties that arise when one actually faces a job situation. The supportive role that subprofessional counselors can play should be particularly helpful in OJT-oriented programs.

It should be cautioned that providing the trainees with personal involvement and support, while helpful to the trainees and appropriate to the subprofessional counselor's skills, does not adequately fulfill the total requirements for counseling in these programs. We have attempted in our analyses of motivational issues to point up some of the circular self-reinforcing aspects of the trainees' problems, which make them particularly resistant to change. Helping the trainees deal with these problems requires planning, direction and a major investment in the counseling effort, in which the largely supportive functions of subprofessionals play a significant but only partial role.

Selection for the Different Staff Roles

In addition to the issue of how staff roles should be defined and what functions they should assume, manpower programs have been concerned with defining criteria for selecting the people who might best fill these roles. One would want all staff members to have a basic sympathy with the trainees, and to approach them without the many current negative stereotypes. However, beyond this, the study findings suggest that there is no general answer to the question of criteria for staff selection. The trainee's reaction to a staff member was very much conditioned by the nature of his role. Thus, the vocational education teacher was viewed almost exclusively in terms of his competence and fairness as a teacher, in marked contrast to the counselor whose impact lay in his ability to establish a relationship of closeness, personal involvement, and trust. One often assumes that this personal empathic quality is crucial in all staff roles; but it may not really be relevant for fulfilling the major function of a vocational educator or other staff roles. It might even be dysfunctional to overly personalize relationships with all staff members, if the trainees are to be prepared for a job world where relationships with supervisors and other authority figures are mainly impersonal and work-related.

The fact that the reactions to the characteristics of a staff member are dependent on the role the staff member performs was strikingly illustrated in the analysis of the men trainees' reactions to Negro and white staff members. The race of the staff member was important in the counselor role, which demands a relationship of closeness and trust; trainees reacted with greater feelings of this closeness and trust when the counselor was Negro. In contrast, race of staff member was not significantly related to the trainees' reactions to basic education and vocational education teachers, where competence and expertise were the critical issues.

In addition to being role-specific, the reactions to race of the staff members were also dependent on the particular function the staff member was playing in his role. Race was particularly relevant for the socializing function. The staff member's stress on certain "middle class" behaviors was more positively accepted by the trainees when it came from a Negro than from a white staff member.

These findings do not discount the prevalent argument that it is important to use "indigenous" staff members in projects such as these, which, when the trainees are Negro, means particularly that the staff members should share the common background and understanding that come from having shared the Negro experience. Rather, the data help differentiate the particular roles and functions where this has special importance from those where it may not be a necessary requirement. It seems to be particularly important when a relationship of closeness and trust is central to the role, and when the staff member is serving as a behavioral and attitudinal model.

The implications of these findings for staff recruitment are to highlight the importance of viewing selection criteria in relation to the functions and requirements of the different staff roles. Since it is usually not possible to fill all roles with indigenous staff members, the emphasis should be on placing them in the roles where this common background would be most crucially relevant. Given the fact that people do not always combine technical competence with the ability to establish relationships of unusual sympathy and rapport, (for example, the vocational educators who tend to come to these projects from job rather than teaching backgrounds) it is appropriate to settle more realistically for people with strengths in the areas most relevant to their particular role.

Factors Related to Trainee Success

This study examined the relationship between trainee characteristics and the usual two "success" criteria used to judge manpower projects: retention in the program and job earnings in the post-program period. Following are some overall comments on the findings relevant to the two criteria.

Dropout-Graduation as a "Success" Criterion

Perhaps the major implication of the study findings on factors related to whether or not a trainee graduated from the program is to question the use of dropout-graduation as a success criterion. First of all, it was noted that graduation from the program did not necessarily mean an immediate job placement by the project. Over 20 percent of the trainees were not placed on a job until some time after graduation and roughly another 20 percent were not placed at all. Moreover, even the most "successful" trainees, those who graduated and received an immediate job placement, did not get jobs with higher wage rates than those of the trainees who had dropped out of the program. When compared to the dropouts, the successful graduates did have higher total job earnings in the post-program period, but this was completely due to the greater regularity of their employment and not to a higher wage rate. And even this difference in regularity of employment did not obtain when we compared the dropouts with the graduates who were not immediately placed on a job.

Because of these obvious differences in the two types of program graduates, they were separated in our analyses of the data. However, even with this refinement, when we compared the dropouts only with the "successful" graduates who were placed immediately upon graduation, there was much less relationship between dropout-completion and other factors than we found in relating these factors to the job earnings criterion. In a few instances the findings were parallel, when the characteristics were those which one intuitively might have expected to lead to the lesser commitment reflected in dropout: among the men, the dropouts, like the trainees with lower job earnings, tended to be younger and with a less regular pre-program job history; among the women, the dropouts and lower job earners more often had the burden of two or more children. But the other factors that differentiated trainees with lower and higher earnings--educational attainment, family responsibilities and pressures among the men trainees, trainee attitudes and motivations as suggested by the supervisors' ratings and by the trainees' own expressions of efficacy and powerlessness--showed no significant differences between dropouts and the more successful program graduates.

If anything, the findings in the dropout analysis pinpointed the problems in one of the graduating groups--the men trainees who graduated but were not immediately placed by the project. They tended to be lower in educational attainment and achievement, were rated lower by their job supervisors, and expressed more intrapunitiveness and self-blame.

Thus, even if we look only at the most successful program graduates, with one or two exceptions there were no background or motivational factors that influenced the decision to drop out of the program or stay with it to a successful conclusion. These essentially negative findings are consistent with the fact that the gains for completing the program were somewhat limited: the successful program graduates had more regular employment than the dropouts in the post-program period, but the wage rates of the jobs they received were no greater. Since completing the program successfully brought no payoff in a clearly better job it is not surprising that the ablest and most motivated trainees did not necessarily remain with the program until graduation.

We have suggested that the limited payoff for completing the JOBS-I project may have been related to some of the special problems that the project experienced, particularly in its OJT wing, in providing skill training that was later utilized in the jobs that the program graduates received. However, the problem seems to be more general than that. Other studies that have compared dropouts and program graduates on very broad national samples of manpower projects have yielded similar findings: while those who complete the program tend to have more regular post-program employment, they have not generally been more successful than the dropouts in attaining better-paying jobs.

These findings of this and other studies suggest that the great concern that manpower programs have expressed over the dropout issue may have been somewhat misdirected. When dropping out does not impede a trainee's success in the job market the critical issue is not why many people drop out but rather why there is no greater reward for successfully completing the program. To some extent these findings reflect the fact that manpower programs have traditionally focused their efforts on preparing people for jobs rather than on developing job opportunities. More recently there have been attempts to redress this imbalance, and manpower projects have become increasingly concerned with job development, and with improving the articulation between the training program and the job market. The implications of our findings comparing dropouts and program graduates are to underscore the importance of these efforts.

Factors Related to Post-Program Earnings

The job earnings of the trainees in the post-program period were related to a number of background characteristics. Some of these indicated continuity with patterns established before the trainees entered the program: trainees with higher earnings had a better pre-program job history, had achieved a higher level of education, and, among the men trainees, came from families where a larger proportion of the men were employed.

The findings also indicated that earnings were highly related to immediate situational pressures on the trainee. Among the men, earnings were clearly related to age and the increasing responsibilities that come with age: the higher earners tended to be in their early twenties rather than their late teens, married and living in their own household rather than single and supported in their parents' home. Among women the relationships were more complex and tended to be curvilinear, since increasing responsibilities while they bring a greater need to work, also create difficulties for working, as indicated in the finding that a larger proportion of low earners were women with two or more children.

One general implication of these findings is to underscore the importance of realizing the distinctions that exist among the people who come to a training program. The trainees may appear to be a very homogeneous group, and differences of one or two years of age or education may seem of little relevance. However, small differences may reflect very significant distinctions, with striking implications for the trainees' ability and motivation to utilize a training program. In manpower programs we have to be sensitive to these individual trainee differences, and flexible in accomodating to them.

In addition to these general comments, the specific findings for the men trainees relating earnings to age and family responsibilities are of particular significance. They suggest that the problem of teen age Negro unemployment is not so much the unavailability of any jobs as it is the kinds of jobs that are available. No special disadvantages distinguished the Negro youth in their late teens in our study from those in their early twenties, to explain their lower employment rates; the major difference was that the younger men, with fewer responsibilities, had more option to reject the kind of employment available to them. The obvious implications are that solutions to these problems lie not in providing these youth with "a" job--but in providing them the opportunity for jobs with meaningful skill and mobility possibilities.

In addition to these relationships between background characteristics and success, this study investigated the influence of motivational and attitudinal factors. Most of the concepts and data were organized around the distinction between two approaches to the motivational problems of "hard core" poverty populations: the view that these problems reflect a lack of some of the usual "middle class" goals, aspirations and values, and the view that stresses problems of efficacy and powerlessness, the inability to implement these goals and values. While recognizing that there is no "either-or" answer to these issues and that both approaches are likely to have relevance for different people in poverty situations, the findings in this study highlight the problems of powerlessness. A "personal efficacy" scale designed to measure the sense of effectiveness and control was the only measure of attitudes and values in the study that showed a clear and striking positive relationship (for the men trainees) with the job earnings success criterion. The relationship was circular: personal efficacy both predicted job success and was affected by it.

A major implication of viewing these problems in terms of efficacy and powerlessness rather than distinctive "culture of poverty" norms and values is to provide an orientation that sees motivational problems not as "in" the trainees, the products of their past experiences, but rather as representing the interaction of the trainee with the pressures and realities of his present life situation. This point of view is consistent with a number of the other findings in this study which have suggested that a trainee's problems of motivation might better be understood as reactions to his present reality situation than as reflections of deep lying individual pathology. The commitment problems that arose when a trainee did not see his basic education and other aspects of his training as relevant to a job, the decrease in attendance and motivation that occurred when skill-training was not provided by the project, the relationship between employment and the extent of a man's familial responsibilities, the fact that a trainee's sense of efficacy was increased by his experience of success in the job market--all suggest the extent to which a trainee's attitudes and motivations reflect the realities, rewards and pressures of his present life situation.

In this summary chapter we have already pointed out some of the program implications of this motivational orientation. In general it tends to support the movement in manpower programs from institutional to OJT settings. A view of problems as "in" the trainees is consistent with the institutional approach which focuses on attempts to change the trainee, to "prepare" him for the occupational world by teaching him educational and vocational skills and job-relevant behaviors and values. The OJT setting provides more of an opportunity to come to grips with the situational determinants of the trainee's problems. Among the more specific recommendations that follow from this orientation, the following have been highlighted in this report: the crucial importance of job placement and job development activities to insure a meaningful payoff to trainees who go through a program; the value of focusing counseling efforts on problems as they arise in the actual job setting (in the post-training as well as the training period) rather than on "socializing" attempts to prepare trainees for that world; the need for the training environment to be realistic as well as supportive, particularly that the trainee come to see his successes and failures as tied to his own developing skills and competence.

Sex Differences

In the analyses of the study data, a number of interesting differences appeared between the men and women trainees. In general, the differences were those one would expect to find in any population in our society. The sex discrimination in employment prevalent in the society at large exists also among the trainees: the women trainees, although they had more education than the men, worked less and for lower pay in the post-program period. The women trainees were also more passive in the job market, indicating less movement and attempts to get something better. Increasing family responsibilities were positively related to the man's but not the woman's employment and earnings. The man's identity was more engaged in the occupational area: job earnings were related to the sense of efficacy among the men but not the women trainees; it was the men not the women whose failure in the job world was accompanied by intrapunitiveness and self-blame.

These differences, though obvious, are important to mention, because they question some of our stereotypes in viewing ghetto youth. So much has been made of the matriarchal nature, the "female dominance" of the lower class Negro family that one might have expected some sex role reversals in the findings we have noted. Since manpower programs are concerned with the differing problems of men and women trainees, it is important to realize that the sex pattern is probably more similar than different to that which is prevalent in our society generally.

Concluding Comments

In the 1968 Manpower Report of the President, the discussion of social-psychological barriers to employment concluded (p. 89) with some comments on the movement away from the "preparatory" programs in institutional settings to those which stress getting workers into jobs with the provision of supportive services. We have referred to this shift at numerous points in this report, and in general have supported both the rationale underlying this change and some of the specific program activities that have accompanied it. To some extent this may reflect the fact that the project we studied followed the institutional "preparatory" model, so the problems in this model were the more obvious ones.

Perhaps, then, it is appropriate to conclude with some cautions that our data suggest about the programs that are increasingly focusing their efforts in on-the-job settings. Two cautions in particular should be stressed. First, the focus on getting the trainees a job should not obscure the fact that what is important is not to provide the trainees with work, but with work that is meaningful, that demands competence, that represents some opportunity. Secondly, the swing away from some of the psychological assumptions underlying the institutional socializing programs, and the movement toward a more pragmatic situationally-oriented approach, should not divert attention from the serious psychological and motivational issues that remain, and the large and long-term investment in counseling services that will probably still be required.

When people grapple with overwhelming problems, their suggested solutions often follow the swings of a pendulum. Finding their attempts at solution frustrated by the complexities of the issues, they tend to react by a complete rejection of all aspects of their initial attempts, and swing to opposite extremes. At the present stage of manpower programs, given the limited state of our knowledge, this is a tendency to guard against.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Academy of Arts and Sciences. *Bulletin*. January, 1968.

Atkinson, J. W. *An Introduction to Motivation*. New York: Van Nostrand, 1964.

Battle, E. and Rotter, J. R. "Children's Estimates of their Schoolwork Ability as a Function of Sex, Race, and Socioeconomic Level," *Journal of Personality*, 1963, *31*, 203-24.

Bennion, R. *Task, Trial by Trial Score Variability of Internal v. External Control of Reinforcements*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1961.

Bradford, D. L. *The Formation of Achievement Attitudes Among Lower-Class Negro Youth*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1966.

Coleman, J. S., *et al*. *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Crandall, V. "The Reinforcement Effects of Adult Reactions and Nonreactions on Children's Achievement Expectations," *Child Development*, 1963, *34*, 335-54.

Crandall, V. C., Good, Suzanne, and Crandall, V. "The Reinforcement Effects of Adult Reactions and Nonreactions on Children's Achievement Expectations: A Replication Study," *Child Development*, 1964, *35*, 485-97.

Cloward, R. A. and Ontell, R. "Our Illusions About Training," *American Child*, *47*, 1, January 1965, 6-10.

Feather, N. "Effects of Prior Success and Failure on Expectations of Success and Subsequent Performance," *JPSP*, 1966, *3*, 287-98.

__________. "Changes in Confidence Following Success and Failure and its Effects on Subsequent Performance," *JPSP*, 1968, *9*, 38-46.

Grosser, C. *The Role of the Nonprofessional in the Manpower Development Programs*. Mimeo. 58 p.

Hess, R. D. "The Transmission of Cognitive Strategies in Poor Families: The Socialization of Apathy and Underachievement." In Allen, V. (Ed.) *Psychological Factors in Poverty*. Chicago: Markham, 1969.

James, W. Internal v. External Control of Reinforcement as a Basic Variable in Learning Theory. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1957.

James, W. and Rotter, J. R. "Partial and 100% Reinforcement Under Chance and Skill Conditions," Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1958, 55, 397-403.

Lefcourt, H. "Internal v. External Control of Reinforcement: A Review," Psychological Bulletin, 1966, 65, 206-20.

Lewis, H. "The Family: Resources for Change," reprinted in Rainwater, L. and Yancey, W. L., The Moynihan Report and the Politics of Controversy. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1967.

Liebow, E. Tally's Corner. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1966. pp. 222-23.

Miller, S. M., Riessman, F., and Seagull, A. "Poverty and Self-Indulgence: A Critique of the Non-deferred Gratification Pattern." In Ferman, L. A., et al., (Eds.) Poverty in America. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965.

Mischel, W. "Father Absence and Delay of Gratification: Cross Cultural Comparisons," JASP, 1961, 63, 116-24.

Mischel, W. and Grusec, J. "Waiting for Rewards and Punishments: Effects of Time and Probability of Choice," JPSP, 1967, 5, 24-31.

Mischel, W. and Staub, E. "Effects of Expectancy on Working and Waiting for Reward," JPSP, 1965, 2, 625-33.

Pearl, A. and Riessman, F. New Careers for the Poor: The Nonprofessional in Human Service. New York: Free Press, 1965.

Phares, E. J. "Delay, Anxiety, and Expectancy Changes," Psychological Reports, 1966, 18, 679-82.

__________. "Expectancy Changes in Skill and Chance Situations," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1957, 34, 339-42.

Rainwater, L. "Neutralizing the Disinherited: Some Psychological Aspects of Understanding the Poor." In Allen, V. (Ed.) Psychological Factors in Poverty. Chicago: Markham, 1969.

Rotter, J. "Generalized Expectancies for Internal vs. External Control of Reinforcement," Psych. Monogr., 1966, 80, 609.

__________. Social Learning and Clinical Psychology. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1954.

Rotter, J. R., Liverant, S., and Crowne, D. P. "The Growth and Extinction of Expectancies in Chance Controlled and Skilled Tasks," Journal of Psychology, 1961, 52, 161-77.

Rotter, J. R., Seeman, M., and Liverant, S. "Internal v. External Control of Reinforcement: A Major Variable in Behavior Theory." In Washburne, N. F. (Ed.) *Decisions, Values, and Groups*. London: Pergamon Press, 1962, vol. 2.

Rustin, B. "A Way Out of the Exploding Ghetto," *New York Times Magazine*, August 13, 1967.

Rychlak, J. R. and Eacker, J. N. "The Effects of Anxiety, Delay and Reinforcement on Generalized Expectancies," *Journal of Personality*, 1962, *30*, 123-34.

Schrag, P. "Kilmer: Portrait of a Job Corps Center," *Saturday Review*, 1968, *51*, 11, 68-69.

Schwarz, J. C. "Influences Upon Expectancy During Delay," *Journal of Experimental Research in Personality*, 1968, *1*, 211-20.

U. S. President. *Manpower Report*. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1968. pp. 86-89.

Veroff, J. "Theoretical Backgrounds for Studying Origins of Human Motives," *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Behavior Development*, 1965, *11*, 3-18.

APPENDIX A

Securing an Adequate Response Rate in the Post-Training Interview

The sample was comprised of almost 400 inner-city Negro youths who were in the JOBS-I retraining program. It consisted of dropouts from the program as well as those who had completed it. Their termination dates ranged from one year to six months prior to the onset of the interviewing and the latest address for each trainee was at least a year old. Although the trainees proved to be most cooperative in taking the interviews, they were a transient population and difficult to locate. Their friends and relatives were often suspicious and, hence, would offer little or no information to the interviewers. The trainee usually left no forwarding address when he moved; however, a trainee tended to move within a limited area, often within the same apartment building, and even an outdated address was an invaluable clue to his whereabouts.

Despite the difficulties of locating our sample and obtaining their cooperation to be interviewed in a four to five hour interview, we were able to interview 89 percent of the sample. The problem of trainee cooperation was met by offering the trainee $7.50 for an interview; that this was successful is indicated by the fact that only one trainee refused to be interviewed. The problem, then, became one of locating the trainees. The procedures we developed are discussed in the following pages.

Techniques Used by Interviewers

Interviewers were given assignment sheets which contained information from the outdated JOBS Project Application forms: name, address, area in Chicago (e.g., 200 south, 300 west), telephone number (if any), parent's name and address or person to contact in emergency, e.g., an aunt.

Letters were sent to each trainee, informing him of the research and requesting an appointment. The letter informed the trainee that he would be paid $7.50 for the interview. Trainees were invited to call the office and make an appointment for an interview, but only three did so. In all other cases, the letter was followed by either a phone call from the interviewer or a visit. The latter approach turned out to be preferable in terms of actually getting an interview.

Weekends proved to be the best time to find trainees at home. If an interview could be taken when the contact was made, it was done then; if not, an appointment for a time convenient to the trainee was arranged. Often the trainee did not show up for the later appointment; however, the interviewer soon learned to accept this with equanimity and simply arranged another appointment.

When the trainee was obviously avoiding an interviewer, the assignment was given to another interviewer, usually of the opposite sex, and interviews were obtained by the second or third person to try a given trainee. There was only one absolute refusal and this trainee refused three people.

In the majority of cases the trainee no longer lived at the address given. In such cases, nothing substitutes for footwork on the part of the interviewer. He must go to the neighborhood, check the mailboxes, talk to the landlord, ask the neighbors, talk to the block precinct captain, and/or ask children in the neighborhood about the trainee.

One interviewer discovered the technique of leaving a copy of the original letter, with its promise of payment and explanation of what was desired, with numerous people in the neighborhood. The letter was enclosed in an unsealed envelope so that the person who promised to give it to the trainee (if he should happen to see him) could read it. Relatives and friends were anxious to protect trainees from bill collectors and welfare or government agents; the open letters were designed to allay such fears.

In one case, an interviewer left the letter with the landlord and then obtained and followed up a lead from a building occupant whom she encountered in the elevator of the housing project. By the time she got to the new address, the trainee was looking for her.

Pool halls and drug stores or other hangouts were sources of information. One interviewer walked along the street and asked each passing person about a trainee. One woman he asked turned out to be the trainee's mother and she provided the address information.

An excellent source of information was the trainee being interviewed. Often he knew others in the sample and could give a phone number or address. One trainee rode across town with an interviewer because he could visualize the building and apartment but did not know the address well enough to tell her. The two of them checked three floors in one building before locating the correct apartment.

Additional Information Obtained by Staff

All contacts with public agencies were handled through the office and a number of helpful sources of information were located. Often, agencies offered to contact trainees for us, but these offers were declined, since we wanted the contact to come from the research group.

We could not, of course, present any agency with a list of 200 to 300 names, so we tried to locate as many interviewees as we could before going to an agency for help. The list to Public Aid differed, of course, from the one to Public Housing, but we found that around 30 names was the maximum we could inquire about and still get wholehearted cooperation.

The Mayor's Committee on Cultural and Economic Development was located in the same office building as the research office and provided the staff with excellent advice, as well as entree to many agencies in Chicago.

One of these was the Mayor's Committee on Human Relations which checked through its employment files for possible listings of trainees. It checked the police records and located two trainees in prison. The staff then called the warden of the county prison and he very graciously granted permission to do the interviews.

Another agency, Public Housing, went out of its way to locate trainees who were in the housing projects and to check on forwarding addresses for those who had moved.

Cook County Public Aid did a search for trainees and their relatives who had indicated public aid on their application forms and who were currently on welfare. In addition, we had frequent contact with a case worker at Public Aid. We also utilized the Central Records Office and the Special Service Referral Office for individual cases.

The interviews of trainees were read by the research staff and those who mentioned another trainee as one of their five best friends were contacted for address information. This proved to be a good source because, as indicated earlier, the trainees themselves were very cooperative.

Payment to Interviewers

A final note might be made regarding the payment of interviewers. Instead of the usual hourly rate (which includes traveling time and time spent locating the person being interviewed) interviewers were paid $20 for each interview. Although this arrangement meant that we had to hire more than twice the number of interviewers than actually ended up doing the interviewing (since only those who had the ingenuity to locate the trainees quickly and efficiently remained on the job), it was a mutually advantageous arrangement. For those interviewers who could do the job, the method of payment was an arrangement that provided them as much or more than the more usual hourly rate would have provided. For the research study, the assurance of efficiency in locating trainees prevented what would have been very great costs.

OE 6000 (REV. 9-66)

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ERIC REPORT RESUME

(TOP)

ERIC ACCESSION NO.

CLEARINGHOUSE ACCESSION NUMBER

RESUME DATE 12 – 01 – 68

P.A.

T.A.

IS DOCUMENT COPYRIGHTED? YES ☐ NO ☒

ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE? YES ☒ NO ☐

TITLE
Inner-City Negro Youth in a Job Training Program: A Study of Factors Related to Attrition and Job Success (final report)

PERSONAL AUTHOR(S)
Gerald Gurin

INSTITUTION (SOURCE)
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., Institute for Social Research

SOURCE CODE

REPORT/SERIES NO.

OTHER SOURCE

SOURCE CODE

OTHER REPORT NO.

OTHER SOURCE

SOURCE CODE

OTHER REPORT NO.

PUB'L. DATE 12 – 01 – 68

CONTRACT/GRANT NUMBER OE 5-10-243

PAGINATION, ETC.
155 pages

RETRIEVAL TERMS

IDENTIFIERS

ABSTRACT
This reports a research study of an experimental and demonstration job training project for underemployed "functionally illiterate" inner-city Negro youth. The project included basic education and group and personal counseling. Trainees were interviewed upon entering the project, at its completion, and six to nine months after leaving it. Trainees' mothers, job supervisors and project staff were also interviewed.

One data analysis explored trainees' reactions to skill training, basic education and counseling, and drew some general implications for these activities in training programs for inner-city youth.

The second major data analysis related trainee back[illegible]d and motivational characteristics to two "success" criteria: dropout-graduation and post-program job earnings. Higher earnings were related to several factors indicating continuity with pre-program patterns, e.g., a better pre-program job history, higher educational attainment and, for the men trainees, a better familial employment history. Higher earnings were also related to immediate situational pressures: among the men, earnings were related to age and increasing familial responsibilities. In the motivational area, earnings were related to feelings of efficacy and powerlessness, but not to measures of "middle-class" beliefs and values.

Dropout-graduation showed much less relation than earnings with trainee background and motivation, even when only graduates successfully placed on a job were considered. Successfully placed graduates and dropouts also did not differ in the wage rates of their post-program jobs. These findings raise questions about the validity of dropout-placement as a criterion of success or failure.

OE 6000 (Rev. 9-66)

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING ERIC REPORT RESUME

The resume is used to identify summary data and information about each document acquired, processed, and stored within the ERIC system. In addition to serving as a permanent record of the document in the collection, the resume is also a means of dissemination. All fields of the form must be completed in the allotted spaces, but inapplicable fields should be left blank. The following instructions are keyed to the line numbers appearing in the left margin of the form:

TOP LINE. ERIC Accession No. Leave blank. A permanent ED number will be assigned to each resume and its corresponding document as they are processed into the ERIC system.

LINE 001. Clearinghouse Accession No. For use only by ERIC Clearinghouses. Enter the alpha code and 6-digit document number.

Resume Date. In numeric form, enter month, day, and year that resume is completed. *(Example: 07 14 66)*

P.A. Leave blank.

T.A. Leave blank.

Copyright. Check appropriate block to denote presence of copyrighted material within the document.

ERIC Reproduction Release. Check appropriate block to indicate that ERIC has permission to reproduce the document and its resume form.

LINES 100-103. Title. Enter the complete document title, including subtitles if they add significant information. Where applicable, also enter volume number or part number, and the type of document *(Final Report, Interim Report, Thesis, etc.)*.

LINE 200. Personal Author(s). Enter personal author(s), last name first. *(Example: Doe, John J.)* If two authors are given, enter both. *(Example: Doe, John J. Smith, Ted)*. If there are three or more authors, list only one followed by "and others."

LINE 300. Institution *(Source)*. Enter the name of the organization which originated the report. Include the address *(city and State)* and the subordinate unit of the organization. *(Example: Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass., School of Education.)*

Source Code. Leave blank.

LINE 310. Report/Series No. Enter any unique number assigned to the document by the institutional source. *(Example: SC-1231)*

LINE 320. Other Source. Use only when a second source is associated with the document. Follow instructions for Line 300 above.

Source Code. Leave blank.

LINE 330. Other Report No. Enter document number assigned by the second source.

LINE 340. Other Source. Use only when a third source is associated with the document. Follow instructions for Line 300 above.

Source Code. Leave blank.

LINE 350. Other Report No. Enter document number assigned by the third source.

LINE 400. Publication Date. Enter the day, month, and year of the document. *(Example: 12 Jun 66)*

Contract/Grant Number. Applicable only for documents generated from research sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education. Enter appropriate contract or grant number and its prefix. *(Example: OEC-1-6-061234-0033)*

LINES 500-501. Pagination, etc. Enter the total number of pages of the document, including illustrations and appendixes. *(Example: 115p.)* USE THIS SPACE FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PERTINENT TO THE DOCUMENT, such as publisher, journal citation, and other contract numbers.

LINES 600-606. Retrieval Terms. Enter the important subject terms *(descriptors)* which, taken as a group, adequately describe the contents of the document.

LINE 607. Identifiers. Enter any additional important terms, more specific than descriptors, such as trade names, equipment model names and numbers, organization and project names, discussed in the document.

LINES 800-822. Abstract. Enter an informative abstract of the document. Its style and content must be suitable for public announcement and dissemination.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1966 O—[illegible]